BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1854. NO. 1.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS.--One Dollar for the Year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

OBEDIENCE TO GOD.

BY THE EDITOR.

DANIEL III. 17, 18: "If it be so, our God, whom we serve, is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace; and he shall deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."

All are acquainted with the circumstances recorded in the chapter from which the text is selected. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, had caused an immense image of gold to be erected in the plain of Dura. To the dedication of this image, he called together the princes, governors, captains, judges, treasurers, counsellors, sheriffs, and all the rulers of the vast province of Babylon. When assembled, he caused a herald to cry aloud, to all the people, that at what time they should hear all kinds of music, they should fall down and worship the golden image, and informed them, that any one who refused to comply should be cast into a burning fiery furnace. Shadrack, Meshack, and Abednego, who were Jews, refused to comply with the requirement, in consequence of which they were ordered before the king and interrogated concerning the matter. The king assured them there was no escape; they must fall down and worship or they should at once be cast into the fiery furnace, and intimated their folly in trusting that their God could deliver them. They replied—that they were not careful to answer him in the matter; and closed in the language of our text, which is expressive of strong confidence in God, and a fixed purpose not to dishonor him by paying homage to an image. The doctrine we would draw from this text, and which we shall attempt to illustrate and enforce is contained in the following

PROPOSITION, *viz:*—

That it is our DUTY, SAFETY, *and* HAPPINESS *to* OBEY GOD *at all times and under all circumstances.*

We presume it will be readily admitted, that, if there *ever* was a time, and if there ever were circumstances in which men would have been justified, in at all departing from strict obedience to God, *that* was the time, and *those* were *the* circumstances in which these men were placed. If, then, it was *their* duty, safety, and happiness, to obey God, in such a case, we may safely infer, that it is *ours*, and the duty of all men, at *all times*, and under *all circumstances*. We shall call your attention,

I. TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THESE MEN.

II. THE GROUNDS OF THEIR CONFIDENCE AND TRUST IN GOD.

III. THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR FIRMNESS.

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THESE MEN.

Their circumstances were such as to render their situation *peculiarly* trying and difficult.

1. *They were filling high and important offices in the Province of Babylon.*

It is true, that this circumstance, in *itself* considered, is not of much importance; but when we take into the account that they were *a part* of a nation who were now in bondage, in Babylon, and that their conduct must have an important bearing on their countrymen, the Jews, for good or evil, we see their situation becomes exceedingly trying. If they were only to act for themselves, the mere fact of their high station would be unworthy of notice.

Thus situated, what would be the natural language of a time-serving policy? It would have said—"You are not at liberty to set up your *private* views of duty, and act upon them, for you are *public* servants; and, if you refuse to bow down before the image you will not only lose your own lives, and thereby deprive your countrymen of the benefit of your services, in their bondage, but you will excite the government against the Jews, by raising a suspicion of their want of fidelity, which will bring down an overwhelming torrent of persecution upon them. You certainly ought to take this into the account, and remember whatever you might do under *other* circumstances, you are now carefully to weigh the consequences: the consequences will be awful—*indescribably awful;* and to talk about not regarding the consequences, is the very height of fanaticism—none but *enthusiasts* and *mad-men* would be guilty of such daring folly. By all means, therefore, you should *this once* fall down before the image. By doing so, the gain to yourselves and countrymen will be incalculably great."

Such would have been the language of the expediency age in which we live, when men think it is almost a crime to be in *advance* of public sentiment, and that the man who is so, is a fanatic, or an infidel. Shadrack, Meshack, and

Abednego, it might have been urged, would be guilty of all, and might justly be reproached as the authors of all the calamities that might result to the Jews by refusing to fall down on this occasion; so entirely destitute are most men of the claims of *right principles*, which are but the voice of God, to a correspondent *right action*.—Men seem to think that right principles are of no more binding force, under certain circumstances, than the principles, if we may give them that name, of aspiring politicians who seek their own aggrandizement, and care not who suffers, who is in prison, or who are crushed by oppression, if they can only effect their own selfish purposes.

These three Hebrews had planted their feet upon the rock of right principles; but they, as wise and understanding men, were not insensible to the probable consequences of their refusal to worship the image, when looked at only as men of *this world*. They could foresee, as clearly as their opposers, that if God did not appear in some way for the defense of the cause of truth, beyond what mere human wisdom could discover, the most disastrous results must follow: and we have no evidence that these men had any assurance, beyond what was contained in the *written* word, that there should be any interposition to prevent the natural result of their refusal to comply, on that occasion. We ask then, was this not a most trying circumstance? And had they been actuated by human policy, or a time-serving spirit, must they not have complied? How many, under the morality taught at the present day, would have stood erect? It is to be feared the number is few. The terror of losing some petty office, in church or state, is quite sufficient for multitudes of the present age, without any addition of other terrible consequences: they will bow and lick the dust to obtain or retain such office. Unhappy men! May the good Lord pity them, and teach them, before it is too late, that "he that findeth his life," by the sacrifice of right principles, "shall lose it;" while "he that loseth his life," in defence of those principles, "shall save it."

2d. The situation of these men was trying, from the consideration—

That a LAW, *or edict, was promulgated, requiring all to fall down and worship the image.*

Nothing is more common than to hear it said that men cannot do a thing, because the law or church prohibits it: or, that we must do so, or so, because the law or creed requires it. Well, here is a case in point. A law requires these Hebrews, with others, to fall down and worship the image. Shall they presume to set themselves up in opposition to the law of the land! Might not their opposers ask them,—"Does not your religion teach you the duty of obeying magistrates? If you refuse to obey, on this occasion, will you not give the lie to the principles of your own religion? and thereby bring it into contempt?" And, adds the time-serving policy, "You will *injure the cause* you wish to advance." "It must be right," the same policy continues, "to obey the laws of the land! We are not responsible for the laws, our rulers must answer for them; and nothing can be more preposterous than for a few persons to think of going in the face of the law! It is the wildest fanaticism! So give up your folly and comply with the laws."

All this is plausible, and well calculated to mislead men who are governed by *appearances* rather than the truth or right principles. The men of whom we are discoursing, undoubtedly felt that the fact, that the law required them to fall down and worship the image, was a trying circumstance. Shall they not obey? To that inquiry we shall call your attention in another part of this discourse.

3d. The circumstances of these men were peculiarly trying from the consideration—*That all around them comply with the mandate of the king.*

At the signal given, all the princes, governors, captains, judges, &c., fall down and worship the image—there was one united and universal prostration:—it was a full and strong *expression* of "public sentiment." Three men only are seen standing. These men have the "*presumption*" to act in opposition to the many!—Strange conduct this! At least, so would a time-serving spirit decide. It is not so easy a matter for men to be *singular*. There is a strong propensity to go with the *multitude*: and it requires more than an ordinary degree of firmness to withstand the example of the many.

All are prostrate on this occasion. There stand the three Hebrews *alone*. Imagine the ridicule that would be employed to shame them out of their "singularity." We fancy we hear a Governor yonder, saying to his comrades around him, "See those Hebrews *standing up*—I wonder if they are not ashamed to be so singular." "I wonder," says another, "if they think they *know more* than everybody else?" "Ay," exclaims a third, "they think they are wiser than all our great men—they have set themselves above our statesmen; yea, above our Doctors of Divinity,—those comparatively young men vainly think that they are going to set themselves up for *reformers*." "I suspect," cries a fourth, they will learn a lesson by and by when they feel the fire of yonder furnace kindle on them,—I guess they will find it not so desirable as they imagine to smell fire, or be martyrs." "For my part," says a fifth, "I believe idolatry, in the abstract, is wrong; but under *present circumstances* it is right; at any rate. I have no notion of going in advance of public opinion, and I think a man is perfectly fanatical that does it." "I am not so clear," responds a sixth, "that falling down to an idol is wrong, for the Bible says, 'an idol is *nothing* in the world,' and surely there can be no great harm, for the sake of keeping *peace*, and to prevent disturbance by setting ourselves up against public sentiment, for us just to fall down now, '*this once*,' to that, which is, after all, nothing." "Those men are foreigners," cries a seventh, "and they have no business to meddle with our domestic institu-

tions; we have worshipped images for hundreds of years; it is a long established institution, and though it might have been wrong when first introduced, yet it is entailed upon us, and it would bring confusion, disorder and ruin to attempt to abolish it now."

Such we may suppose would be some of the language employed by those whose interest it was to sustain idolatry, or who had not moral courage enough to oppose public sentiment which was corrupt enough to sustain image worship, or creed worship.

Men naturally feel much concern for their reputation; especially if they are now in possession of a respectable character. They seem to dread nothing more than the loss of that honor they now enjoy. Hence, opposition to the most important reforms usually originates with men who love popular favor; nor will they move in any reform until it first becomes popular; and then, not so much for any *right principles* or love to truth they possess as from a desire to retain that public favor which they now see must be lost if they longer stand aloof. To see men espouse a cause when the public sentiment of Church or State is against it, and that from a conviction that the cause is a *righteous* one, and truth demands their support, shows great moral courage; but it subjects its advocates to great reproach, and to be denounced as fanatics, fools, mad men, or infidels. Such reproach is trying to human nature; and it is not to be supposed that any sensible man would subject himself to it unless upon conviction that truth and faithfulness to God required it of him.

The reproach then these three Hebrews must endure for their extreme singularity cannot so easily be conceived of;—to have a tolerable idea of it, a man must be placed in a somewhat similar situation, and that is not likely to take place, with most of us, 'till the standard of morality and love for truth is raised much higher than what most teachers of religion, in the present age, have placed it.

From the consideration of the reproach these men must endure by their refusal to fall down before the image, and their extreme singularity, must not their circumstances have been extremely trying?

Not only were they subjected to scorn and ridicule, for their want of conformity to the general sentiments of those around them, but—

4th. *They were terribly threatened with a most horrid infliction of public vengeance if they dared to dissent from the practice of the mighty men assembled on the occasion.*

"Whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace." To be at once cast down from honorable stations, and put to a most disgraceful, painful, and *public* death, was a trial of integrity, and honest adherence to truth and right principles, which few, perhaps, could have endured the thought of without having been overcome. Under the time-serving policy of our age, probably, most men would think they had a sufficient excuse, in such circumstances, for *seeming*, at least, to fall down and worship the image. Human policy would have said, "It is your duty to yourself, to your family, to your country, and to the church, to save your life. True, it is wrong in the abstract to worship an image, but under present circumstances it is not only right, but '*Christianity enjoins*' it: yea, the '*golden rule*' *requires it.*"

Such is the language of the *expediency*, that has taken the place of the Bible, in these last times.

5th. *Another circumstance that served to make their situation peculiarly trying was the fact, that flattery was resorted to, to induce them to comply.*

Many persons who have successfully resisted all other attempts to draw them aside from the path of duty, and firm adherence to right principles, have fallen before flattery. In fact, it requires much more moral courage and firmness to resist flattery than any other, or all other agencies: because flattery comes in the garment of a friend concerned for our reputation and welfare; and it seems ungrateful in us not to regard the kind feelings and tender concern of those who take pains to let us know how much they esteem us. Hence, it is much more difficult to resist the persuasions of apparent friends than the assaults of open enemies.

Now look at the case before us. The king proposed that all the music should be repeated just to accommodate these *three men.* As much as to say, "You are men of standing and worth; if you were mean men you should have no such favor granted you; but men of your respectability and importance in community, I am exceedingly desirous should maintain the high standing to which your merits entitle you; now, therefore, I will give command and the music shall be *repeated* for you three; and certainly you cannot have so little regard for your *reputation* as to refuse to comply with the desire of your Sovereign, who has always shown you the greatest respect, and advanced you to the important offices in the empire that you now fill."

Who would not have given way under such circumstances, and found some excuse, for at least "*this once*," in doing homage to the image? "The very peculiar state of the case," most would have concluded, "justifies us *now* in doing that, which, under other circumstances, would certainly be wrong: and then we mean by it no respect for the image at all, but design to secure a greater amount of good than we think can be secured in any other way, as matters now stand. And besides we certainly are under great obligations to the king, for he has done us much important service, and we should show ourselves exceedingly wanting in gratitude not to do as he desires us now, especially as he has shown so much respect for us, and so much desire for our welfare."

Thus would the time-serving spirit of the present age, have reasoned, and come to the conclusion, that, to persist in the refusal to pay, at least, an *external* homage to the golden image, situated as they were, would be folly and mad-

ness: nay, fanaticism of the worst character.—But thus did not the Hebrews reason. No, trying as their circumstances were they remain firm and unmoved.

[*To be Continued.*]

THE HARTFORD CONVENTION.

The discussion at that Convention, in June, has at last made its appearance, *minus* the last speech of Joseph Barker, which was never returned after the Report of it was sent to him. Why it was not we are not told. We have not had time yet to make our contrast between Joseph Barker *the christian* and Joseph Barker *the deist*, as the Report has but just come into our hands. It makes a book of about 370 pages 12 mo., bound, with an Appendix of some dozen pages; for which we paid 75 cents. The Appendix and Advertisements show what we have before stated as our opinion, *viz*:—That that Convention was got up with the design to *put down* the Bible and *put up* "Spirit Rapping." The latter object was not reached in the Convention because the former was not accomplished; and so the Publishers make up the deficiency by giving a list of "ALL the works devoted to SPIRITUALISM"; *alias*, "*Spirit Rapping*."

At the opening of that Convention, HENRY C. WRIGHT, formerly a Congregational minister, after that a Non-Resistent and Peace man, brought forward the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That the Bible, in some parts of the Old and New Testaments, sanctions injustice, concubinage, prostitution, oppression, war, plunder, and wholesale murder; and, therefore, the doctrines of the Bible, *as a whole*, are false, and injurious to the social and spiritual growth and perfection of man."

To the presentation of this resolution we spoke as follows, as reported:

Mr. GEORGE STORRS then arose and said: Mr. Chairman, when a court is in session, or opens its session, and a person is brought before that court charged with crime, it is important to understand at the outset by what law that person is to be convicted of crime. The Bible is arraigned, charged with crimes, but we have not yet been told by what law the Bible is to be tried. This is a point I want our friends to define. It certainly seems reasonable, that if any individual is to be tried on a charge, he should not only have the charges specified, but it should be specified against what law he has transgressed. What is the use of standing up and testifying against a man ten thousand things, until you have told us by what law the charges are to be tried? Where is the law that proves that theft, and slavery, and lying, and murder are crimes? Just let us have it. If that can be established by our friends, to the understanding of the audience, we are prepared to come and see whether the Bible is guilty of the crimes charged, or not; and until that has been done, I maintain that every word that has been uttered here against the Bible, is without any force or weight; because it has not been shown that the Bible has transgressed any law. I do not stand here to advocate and defend everything we find in our translation. I shall not stand here to defend the Bible against interpolations. You have charged the Bible with crimes. Point us to a clear law by which the Bible is to be tried, and we are ready to defend it. (Applause).

After these remarks, Mr. Wright said he would give us "*the law*;" but to our mind it amounted to *inward consciousness*—nothing more; and we wished him to say that it was natural religion, or the god of nature, if he was disposed to do so. Br. Turner followed Mr. Wright with a good speech, and then we again took the stand, and are reported to have spoken as follows:

Mr. GEORGE STORRS—The resolution brought forward at the opening of this Convention arraigned the Bible before some court, and charged it with certain crimes. I would again ask, if a person be brought before a court, charged with crimes, if it is not right that the law should be defined by which he is to be tried---a law by which it can be judged whether he is a criminal or not? In reply to this question, my friend Mr. Wright, very prettily indeed, appeals to our feelings. "The law is planted in here (touching his breast)---in the constitution of our nature." Is that the law by which the Bible is to be tried, and its morality or irreligion to be tested? Is that the law by which this book is to be proved a wicked thing, or to be justified? Is the Bible to be tried by this law in our nature, which says that murder, theft, slavery, etc., are wrong? I understand that the position which my friend (Mr. Wright) has taken is, after all, that the Bible is to be tried by natural religion.

MR. WRIGHT---Yes, by natural religion.

Mr. STORRS---I ask you then to prove that God is possessed of a solitary moral perfection by natural religion. Tell me how, by natural religion, you are going to demonstrate but that there are more than a million gods in the universe? I am glad that he has said that it was natural religion. We come now to the point---we have something tangible. It is natural religion by which we are to try the Bible. All that you can prove by natural religion, with reference to supreme powers is, that there may be one God or many, and that the God or gods possess intelligence and power; and, for aught that you can know by natural religion, this God or these gods, may have just the character which it has been contended by our opponents the God of the Bible possesses. Does natural religion teach you that God is good, when he suffers so much misery, and woe, and

war and slavery, and blood, and sickness, and death, filling graveyards with human beings? Now, where is your good God? Do not touch the Bible---stand off from that---let revelation alone. Just take your natural religion, and you cannot prove that God is good; and for ought you know, therefore, he is just such a character as sanctions war, slavery, polygamy, etc. I see no possibility of avoiding this conclusion. By natural religion how can you know but that it is right that God should destroy one class of men by another? How do you know that it is wrong for one nation to rise up against another nation, and to commit depredations and destroy one another by war? How do you know that it is wrong to practice polygamy? How do you know it is wrong for God himself to interfere with my rights as a man, having created me? What does natural religion teach you about the animal creation?

See your neighbor take the calf and cut its throat before the eyes of its dam. She moans---she feels bad, don't she? Ah, it is a sin to take the calf and cut its throat---is it not? But natural religion says it is right---you want it to eat; but perhaps my friend *Wright* will say it is *wrong*. [Laughter.] Again a man finds a swarm of bees in a tree, and cutting down the tree, he takes the bees and puts them in his bee-house, and tells them to work for him. They work all summer long; but finally the man comes along who says that he is the "slaveholder," and that he wants the honey. He lights his match of brimstone under them, destroys their life, and takes the honey. He is a robber! Does natural religion say so? Oh, no; but they are inferior to me. Indeed, sir, how inferior you are to God! How do you know but that the God that made you has a right to command you to be slaughtered! Does natural religion tell you that he has not? No. The fact is, that natural religion can prove nothing but that there is a God—whether one or many cannot be determined---and that God possesses power and intelligence; but cannot lead us one step farther in determining his character. Hence, I say, that the rule by which it is claimed that this Bible should be tried, is a defective one, and that the Bible cannot be tested by it. But perhaps I shall hear some one saying, You are not going to compare us to the lower and inferior animals? But, sir, what are you but an animal? I was glad to hear my friend Wright say, that if he did not have any brains, he would have no life; but take away his brains and he would be dead, just as dead as any other animal. Now, I ask, if natural religion allows us to enslave the lower animals---and a great portion of the community take their life out of mere sport---and if the law of natural religion were the same and unchangeable, if it would not condemn every man that takes the life of the meanest insect that crawls upon the earth? Our friends have been building upon a foundation that has been laid for them by some theologians, that man has an immortal soul---that he is a part of God. Whatever else may be charged upon the Bible, this can not. Man is only an animal till there is a development of moral powers by the application of a moral law. What, a part of God! Why, sir, if man is a part of God, there is no such thing as sin; for sin being a departure from God—a violation of some law, there can be no such thing as sin, unless a man should deny himself. Man, a part of God! No, sir, that is an assumption of the human heart in its pride. They would be as gods. I maintain that man by his creation is only an animal of the highest order, and capable of higher development than any other animal; but as to his having an immortal soul, there is no such thing taught in the Bible; therefore the Bible is clear of that charge. Whatever else they shall claim is taught by the Bible, it never taught that man is possessed of an immortal soul. [Cries of Hear, hear.]

A great many complain because Adam should have been placed in a state of trial; but if he had not been, he never could have risen above the state of an animal, for holiness is not a creation but a development; therefore the conditions for such a development were absolutely necessary for the development of Adam---for enabling him to rise in the scale of being and to become a partaker of the Divine nature, if faithful to his God. His very trial was, therefore, on the part of his Creator, an act of mercy and of kindness. That trial was to develop the moral character of Adam, which if in harmony with God, was to entitle him to an endless existence; but he was informed that if it was not in harmony that he should surely die. When we inquire the meaning of death---what is it to die, we must answer, that it is to return back to that state from which man came. What, to be annihilated? Yes, sir, to be annihilated. "But," says one, "there is nothing that can be annihilated." But I ask if he who created cannot annihilate, if he will? The only question is in regard to his will. It is said that nothing can be annihilated; but I ask the objector if he means to say that God Himself can annihilate nothing? Do you not preach from day to day that God made all things out of nothing; and yet do you deny that that Being who created all things out of nothing can return them to that state of nothing---that is, to annihilate them?

Why, sir, I can annihilate some things. Bring me a glass globe. Can I not grind it to powder and annihilate it *as a globe*? You say the particles of matter remain. But does the globe *as a globe* remain? Manifestly it does not; it is annihilated. So man when annihilated will not exist *as man*, whatever becomes of the elements of which he was composed.

Adam was told by the Creator that in case he did not obey the law given to him he should return to the dust from which he came. Now, sir, do you tell me that natural religion teaches a contrary doctrine—the doctrine of the immortality of the soul? Can natural religion point into the future world? If so, what means all the speculation among heathen philosophers about the immortality of the human soul? I ask what does it mean, if natural religion can carry you to another world? No, sir, natural religion can do

no such thing. It remains for revelation to bring forward and develop a future world; and if it remains for revelation to do it, it remains for that revelation to state the terms upon which the Creator will give us a part in the future world.

The Bible has been complained of on account of its teachings concerning women. They read to you, on the one side, passages telling the duties of the wife, but they read nothing prescribing the duties of the husband. Paul commanded that husbands should love their wives as they love themselves. It is a dreadful thing for a woman to be loved by her husband as he loves himself! [Laughter]. I venture to say that there is not a woman of good sense in this house that will not risk the consequences, if she can get a husband that loves her as he loves himself.

The old theological notion of there being infants in hell not a span long has been adverted to. Suppose we threw the Bible away and do not let a ray of its light shine upon us, and I ask you where infants go when they die? They go down into the grave, don't they? Then all the infants that die go into hell---your natural religion hell [applause and laughter]; and you can not demonstrate by your natural religion but that every infant goes into hell. The infant comes into the world a suffering being, travels on in pain and suffering, and drops into the grave. Now, where is your natural religion to comfort you? "Oh I guess it has a soul that goes off in progression." "I guess!" *I* guess it is all guess work. It is the Bible that brings to our view another state, and that by a resurrection through Jesus from the dead.

The question in regard to the Bible is not, in fact, whether that Bible is a revelation, but it is whether it is a faithful history of revelations and certain transactions connected with those revelations; and therefore the whole question turns on the credibility of the Bible witnesses, and whatever charges you may bring against hireling priests, these witnesses are to be judged in their testimony, according to the motives under which they may be reasonably supposed to have acted; and if it appears that their whole course was one of self-sacrifice and pain—that they jeoparded their very lives in giving their testimony, and nothing can be shown to the contrary---then you must accept them as credible witnesses. Further, when it is shown that this suffering and trial was foretold them by their beloved Master, there is no reason that can be given for supposing that they were designing men—men that would palm off on the world a falsehood. So if we go back to the Jewish priesthood---who may be considered as Bible witnesses---do we find them men of selfishness? Did they frame those laws? [turning to Mr. Wright.]

Mr. WRIGHT—Yes.

Mr. STORRS---Let us see whether they were knaves or not. Is it any where evinced in these laws? Did they [the laws] reserve any portion of the land for the priests?

Mr. WRIGHT, interrupting Mr. Storrs, said---They reserve to the priest one-tenth of all the other property.

Mr. STORRS---Does it look like knavery, I say, to cut themselves off from all possessions in Israel? Yet the people were to give them only one-tenth of their crops, etc., and where was the law compelling the people to give it if they did not do it voluntarily?

Now, I say that the priests did not make the laws, and I call upon my friend Wright to prove that they did; and if they did, they made just such laws as knavish priests would not have made---they made a law to prevent their holding possessions in Israel. They made a law by which it was made a voluntary affair with the people to pay them one-tenth of their crops, etc., or not; and there was no law compelling them to pay this tithe.

A VOICE interrupting---The people were not to have any wine the next year in case they did not pay this tithe.

Mr. STORRS---I ask if the priests themselves caused that there should be no wine the next year, after the failure of the people to pay tithe, or did He who caused the herb of the field to grow, cause that there should be no wine? Were you to give knavish priests now the power to make laws to regulate their own salaries, do you think they would exclude themselves from having inheritances among the people, and not make any provision for compelling the people to pay tithes?

A VOICE---No, they would pay more attention to their bread and butter. [Laughter.]

Mr. STORRS---No, indeed; but such was the fact in regard to the Jewish priesthood: they were excluded from having inheritance among the people, and there were no provisions made for enforcing the payment of tithes---there were no pains or penalties to be inflicted on the people in case of their failure to pay. Now, I ask, if such a code of laws gives any evidence of having been gotten up by a corrupt priesthood? No; there is every evidence of the purity and goodness of their motives. So with reference to the witnesses of the New Testament. You say of a corrupt priesthood now-a-days, that they keep a good look-out for their bread and butter; but they sacrificed all---being stoned, whipped, and imprisoned, and were assured by their Master that they should come to a violent death. They went out in the face of public opinion---against a corrupt priesthood---against a corrupt world, civil and ecclesiastical, with their lives in their hands, and proclaimed the great truths and facts of the New Testament. And what are these great facts? Why, the great fact—the solar beam of the New Testament, is *a resurrection from the dead* through our Lord Jesus Christ---that God has given us *eternal life*, and that this life is in his Son, and not in ourselves. Amid all their trials these witnesses maintained their integrity to the end. But you say that Peter denied his Lord, and cursed and swore. Well, I suppose he was a little afraid of the face of clay, as we are sometimes; and who can wonder at it, when we think that we are possessed

of human nature which shrinks at suffering? Why do you not tell us, that when Jesus turned and looked upon Peter, that he went out and wept bitterly? Would it not answer your purpose? It would not, would it? [Applause.] Does the Bible any where say, that any man on earth is ever so good that he may not sin in the hour of temptation? No; if it did, this might be brought up as an excellent thing against the truth and inspiration of the Bible; but it goes on the very ground that we are liable to sin, and that God has promised that if we repent, and use those means or institutions which he has appointed, we may be forgiven our sins and restored to his favor. And so Peter did, and on the day of Pentecost the fear of man was taken away from him. He will not deny his Lord now.

"No, to be sure, but he will dissemble."

The flesh you see, which must be kept "under," is the source of sin; and in the hour of temptation the best man may be led, in view of pain and suffering, to commit a sin, which, on reflection, he would stand up strong against, if he has the principle of holiness in his heart; and this was the case of Peter.

These witnesses went forward testifying to the truth, namely, that Jesus is the Son of God —that Jesus died—that God raised *him* from the dead—that he ascended into heaven—that he is coming again to judge the world, and to give to his people eternal life. They preached Jesus and a resurrection from the dead, and they went forward in their testimony, faithful to the end; and, mark you, they did not, as hypocrites and dissemblers do, conceal their sins. Dissemblers and hypocrites do not tell their sins. No, no, sir, they cover up their sins. The New Testament witnesses did not cover up theirs, as is evinced by the very fact that we have a knowledge of them; and that is another argument in favor of the credibility of the witnesses. All these witnesses testified to facts and truths which they promulgated to the world at the hazard of their lives. As we go forward in this Convention, I have much to say, if I am permitted to say it. [Cries of hear, hear, and applause.]

We shall hereafter make extracts from the speeches of Br. Turner and ourself as we may find space in our columns.

THE SHELL IN DEATH'S JAWS:

OR, A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF A SERMON BY LUTHER LEE.

Br. Storrs—Last Sunday evening I heard your old friend, Luther Lee, preach. His theme was, the Cross of Christ. The two first heads of his discourse I was much pleased with; but when he came to the last—which was the value of the Cross to the dying pilgrim—he seemed to be in the fog. He said the Bible was full of arguments in favor of immortality, but he had not time to present them, and merely gave us a summary of his belief, stating that he had no sympathy with the opposite sentiments, nor with those who believed the present age was near its close, or that the world was growing worse. He was very inconsistent, for he denounced the christianity of the day as an intemperate and slaveholding christianity. And yet it was to be the instrument in converting the world; and he did not know but that it would succeed within the next 150 years; although he acknowledged it had done but little in the past 1800 years. He presented a fine picture of the departure of the pilgrim. I may not remember his entire words, but very nearly so. He said—"Let us view the pilgrim on the banks of the Jordan of death, calm and serene he looks down into the dark waters and there beholds death with its jaws widely extended, just ready to receive him; he starts back at the prospect, but lo! the cross intervenes between those jaws and keeps them asunder, and the pilgrim steps calmly down between them, and there leaves this poor, frail, perishable tenement and in a moment is singing on the *golden hills* beyond Jordan." We had not a word from him of the resurrection, and why should he say any thing about it, for there seems no need of a resurrection, as the pilgrim only left his *shell* in the monster's jaws, and the next moment was exulting in an immortal state! It pained me to hear a man of his intelligence, running so widely opposite the Bible. He conveyed to my mind the idea that the cross intervening between the jaws of death, prevented death from gaining the victory, and consequently the pilgrim did *not die.* I have no desire to misrepresent him, and think I have not; but I suppose he would totally object to my inference, but so his language struck me, and I cannot help it. I am sorry that some one who was capable and willing to report the sermon to you, did not hear it, so that you might have had it.

Br. Lee need not "start back" from such a fine opportunity of losing his *shell* in death's jaws! No wonder he "said nothing of the resurrection." Of what use will it ever be to the "immortal soul," "singing on the *golden hills*"?

The "Review of Luther Lee, by Anthropos," should be more widely circulated; it is a most thorough refutation of his position on immortality. It is a pamphlet of 122 pages, 18 mo. Price 15 cents, or *ten* copies for $1.

Notices.—To Subscribers in Canada the Bible Examiner, now *Semi-monthly*, will be $1, 25 for the year.

Br. Moncrieff.—The Expositor for Dec. has not been received, but Br. Chittenden has loaned us his.

Br. Ham.—Christian Examiner for Dec. is received.

Tracts.—We are at present entirely out of all the Tracts in our catalogue, and cannot say when we shall have more, as they are a bill of expense to us rather than of income. Larger works are mostly wanted, and are more important.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1854.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER for 1854 is commenced *Semi-Monthly*. Shall it be so continued? We trust it will; but the sum necessary to pay the *actual expenses* has not been more than half paid yet. Nevertheless, we have ventured to launch out twice per month, believing that the cause demands it, and that the friends will not leave us to labor *alone*. Through the blessing of God we trust those who love the truth, "*Life and Immortality only through Jesus Christ*," will find themselves abundantly able to sustain the Examiner, and all kindred publications.

When the Examiner was first started, *eleven* years ago, it had not a single subscriber, and was published *solely* at our expense. From '44 to '47 the *occasional* issue continued, and a small amount was furnished by individuals for that object. In '47 it was issued monthly in *quarto* form; in '48 it was changed to its present form and issued at 50 cents per year; but after two years it was found impossible to meet its expenses at that price; and in '50 it was advanced to $1 per year by the general approval of its patrons. Still the list of subscribers did little more than pay the printer's bill for '50 and '51. Since that time there has been a steady increase of interest in the Examiner, but never enough paid in to meet the printer's claim for a *semi-monthly* issue; nor is there near enough yet received to meet that claim for the year upon which we now enter; even making no allowance for compensation for the Editor, who will now, necessarily, be more entirely confined to his labor with the Examiner, and thus be cut off from the help he has received from friends when he visited abroad. Notwithstanding the prospect, *pecuniarily*, is against himself, he has determined to go on semi-monthly, relying upon friends abroad for a strong effort to increase the circulation of the paper; and he sincerely hopes that the effort will be made at once; so his mind shall be unincumbered with care in relation to the expenses of paper and printing.

No subscription of less than *one dollar* will be received; nor will that amount pay for anything beyond the *present year*. If, therefore, the subscriber does not choose to receive the numbers from the commencement of the volume, they are, nevertheless, *his* to dispose of as he may please. We print an even number at each issue, and confusion with loss, would be the result were we to break the volume by a subscriber's not beginning with it. If he chooses to pay his dollar for *a part* only of the volume he can do so. From this rule we cannot depart: nor can we, at present, offer a premium, for *five* dollars. If our list of subscribers comes up to a thousand, then we will give the premium of the *sixth* subscriber to those who send $5.

This number of the Examiner may be sent to a few who have not paid for this year. If so, it is to solicit your subscription. You need not return it, as it will not be followed by another if we do not hear from you; but we hope you may feel inclined to help us on in our work.

The Examiner has *one main object*, which is expressed in our motto, viz:—*No Immortality, nor Endless Life, except through Jesus Christ alone.*" This object will be first and foremost, always. Other topics will find a reasonable space, the Editor being judge what other topics shall enter, and the amount of room it is best they should occupy. There are various and conflicting views, in which brethren and friends are interested, which we should not deem proper to admit into the Examiner because of the space they would necessarily occupy, and because they have no direct connection with the grand theme of our motto. We shall, however, have more on general subjects than heretofore, provided the increasing interest on the *Life Theme* does not demand all the space added by the semi-monthly issue. Circumstances will guide us in that matter.

If an apostle could say—"Brethren, pray for us," surely the Editor of the Examiner may do so: sensible as he is, that without the blessing and aid of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, he must fail to profit his readers, or secure life eternal for himself. He earnestly desires that he may ever, and on all occasions, breathe the spirit that was in our Divine Master and Lord, when he was upon earth; and that no provocation, whether from friends or foes, may ever be suffered to move him from that *love* to God and men which always shone in the life of Jesus Christ, our great example, high priest, life-giver and Lord. Therefore, "*pray for us:*" and may those prayers be reflected back upon *yourselves* in rich blessings unto Life Eternal: so shall we rejoice *together* in the day when the Lord Jesus shall return from heaven.

NEW YORK.—The Li
upon in this city every
and evening—at Mechani
Br. H. L. Hastings and
there alternately for two
is manifestly advancing
seen in the meetings, an
have already occurred,
skeptical, have been led
they never dreamed of;
been made glad by thei
horrible traditions of m
tinue to bless and prosp

PATERSON, N. J.—O
are strong in the truth
and the resurrection:
the effort recently put
Presbyterian minister
faith. We are right gl
called "*orthodox*," ro
their opposition only
and may ultimately be
version to the truth.
probably be had there
tween Mr. Landis and

PHILADELPHIA.—We
month and spent one S
near six months, every
have held a discussion
chose to oppose our vie
through Christ. The
ing has been constantly
their place of public me
to overflowing, and light
Brs. Jacob Grim, W
Stuart, have been the
side of the question: al
what are called "*layme*
there would not come
hard-working brethren
the utmost pleasure t
with that class of men
Theologians. The tru
these brethren strong,
defend the truth agains
can stand up.

We had a short bu
city. May our friends
Jesus, and suffer no "ro
up, and thereby ma
every other considerati
that of the honor of Go
Jesus Christ.

NEW YORK.—The Life-Theme is now dwelt upon in this city every Lord's day—morning and evening—at Mechanics' Hall, 472 Broadway. Br. H. L. Hastings and ourself have preached there alternately for two months past, and truth is manifestly advancing. Many strangers are seen in the meetings, and some interesting cases have already occurred, in which men, before skeptical, have been led to see truth in a light they never dreamed of; while some saints have been made glad by their emancipation from the horrible traditions of men. May the Lord continue to bless and prosper this effort.

PATERSON, N. J.—Our brethren in that city are strong in the truth of life only through Jesus and the resurrection: and none the less so for the effort recently put forth by Mr. Landis, a Presbyterian minister there, to overthrow their faith. We are right glad to get the ministry, called "*orthodox*," roused up to oppose; for their opposition only reveals their weakness, and may ultimately be the means of their conversion to the truth. A public discussion will probably be had there, the present month, between Mr. Landis and Br. Hastings.

PHILADELPHIA.—We visited that city the past month and spent one Sabbath with them. For near six months, every week, our brethren there have held a discussion with any and all who chose to oppose our views of immortality only through Christ. The interest so far from abating has been constantly on the increase, so that their place of public meetings is often crowded to overflowing, and light is spreading in that city. Brs. Jacob Grim, Wm. Ashman, and Wm. Stuart, have been the principal speakers on our side of the question: all of them mechanics; or what are called "*laymen*." Pity the "*Priests*" there would not come out and put to rout these hard-working brethren. It would give them the utmost pleasure to have a friendly conflict with that class of men who, professionally, are Theologians. The truth and God has made these brethren strong, so that they are able to defend the truth against all the opponents that can stand up.

We had a short but profitable time in that city. May our friends there keep the spirit of Jesus, and suffer no "root of bitterness to spring up, and thereby many be defiled." May every other consideration be lost sight of save that of the honor of God and life to men through Jesus Christ.

PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.

We have received the following letters from those engaged under the Prov. Com., in proclaiming Life and Immortality only through Jesus Christ alone.

FROM THOMAS GARBUTT.

Orangeport, N. Y., 1853.

BR. STORRS:—I labored during November in Somerset, Hartland, and Royalton, Niagara Co. My prospects for doing good never looked so bright as at present. I feel that God is in the arrangement I have made with the Provisionary Committee, and my hourly prayer is, that myself and fellow-laborers under its patronage, may be indeed and in truth *soldiers of the cross*.—Eld. Levi Hathaway, a venerable Christian minister, has been of great service to me; a man learned in the Scriptures, of sound judgment, and truly devoted to God. I bless God there are a few such lights in the world. I have every reason to expect many of the Christians in this county will help sustain the truth.

I have preached at Hartland Corners in reply to two lectures in favor of Universalism. Several became deeply interested; saints and sinners wept. I do not know how it will end yet. The sheep are, I am sure, gathering around the great Shepherd. Thus I have hopes. O that God's people would be more faithful. I hope next month to see more turning to God and thus escaping *death*.

Yours, in hope of Immortality,

T. GARBUTT.

Since the foregoing was received the following has come to hand.

Things look still brighter. I have received three more invitations to preach to Christian churches. I have three preachers now on my side, and only one against, and he is not disposed to say much, as many of his church have said they believe man is *mortal*.

The Six Sermons are to work. Backsliders are coming up to the work of the Lord; the Lord is with us of a truth. I see it more every day. I think and pray that we shall have a good old-fashioned revival, so far as the *work of the Spirit* is concerned. Sinners look solemn as death.—May the Lord help. Bro. Storrs, hold fast.

Yours in love,

T. GARBUTT.

FROM J. BLAIN.

Auburn, Nov. 29, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—Since I left New York, three weeks ago, I have disposed of 225 of my work—'Death not Life,'—30 Bible vs. Tradition—40 Pauline Theology, and a number of other works.

I am more and more encouraged as to obtaining means to support those who are willing to preach the life and death doctrine, under the appointment of the Provisionary Committee.—

Where I have traveled, as yet, our plan for spreading truth, meets with about universal approbation, and brethren show it by subscribing. All see more and more plainly that we are using the best means to break the fetters of tradition from the churches.

Since I left New York, the 1st of Nov., I have visited Albany, Troy, Lansingburg, Waterford, Halfmoon, Oppenheim, Herkimer, Utica, Syracuse, Oswego, Port Byron, and Auburn. My traveling expenses for the entire route have been but $7.75. Time forbids giving further particulars at present. J. BLAIN.

FROM C. F. SWEET.

Dec. 2, 1853.

BR. STORRS:—Since I saw you in Dansville, in Oct., I have traveled over 400 miles with my horse and buggy, or on foot, making my traveling expenses small, (1,96). I have had some good meetings, and some opposition; but none of these things move me. I have but one work to do, and that is, to preach the word of life to a lost world. I am encouraged to go on trusting in the Lord. I am happy to be associated with devoted men whose object and aim is to proclaim Jesus Christ as *the life* of the world.—Disunited with him we remain in a state of sin and death.

I have sold all my books and wish you to send me a new supply.

As ever, yours,
C. F. SWEET.

We are sorry to announce that Br. C. M. Richmond, from his pecuniary circumstances, prior to his labors under the Prov. Com., has felt it necessary to engage in business that occupies him during the week, and cannot travel much abroad. His connection with the Committee has therefore ceased for the present. His residence is Peru, Ind. We hope the friends of the cause will call him out into the field all in their power.

Br. J. S. White, also, has felt that he could not give all his time to labor under the Prov. Com., and has concluded to work entirely on his own responsibility. Br. White is ready to preach the word of life to those who may need his services as he may have opportunity, and we hope he may be abundantly sustained; and we are satisfied he must be useful wherever he goes.

PROV. COM'S. RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS.

Total Receipts, previously reported,		$252,65
Received since last report as follows:		
Friends in Orangeport, N.Y., by T. Garbutt,		6,50
" Somersett, " " "		6,00
" LeRaysville, Pa., by C. F. Sweet,		11,00
" Hector, N. Y. " "		11,75
" in small sums, " "		2,25
A friend at Martin's Hill, N. Y., " "		4,00
" Lawrenceville, Pa., " "		1,00
" Manayunk, Pa., by Geo. Storrs,		5,00
" Buckland, Mass., by letter,		3,00
Friends in various places, by Br. Blain,		12,00
Albany $4; Halfmoon $3; Oswego $6; Syracuse $2; Herkimer and Utica $3. These are among the places where Br. Blain collected funds, and included in the above, or previous receipts from him.		
Friends in Williamsburg, N. Y., by R. T. Young,		2,00
Total the past month,		$64,50
Total Receipts,		$317,15
Total disbursements, previously rep'ted		$276,85
Paid since last Report, as follows:		
To Br. T. Garbutt, - -		$12,50
" C. T. Sweet, - - -		52, 65
" J. Blain, - - -		6,00
Total the past month,		$71,15
Total Disbursements,		$348,00
Treasury Overdrawn,		$30,65

ELD. E. R. PINNEY'S article on the inquiry, "*What is the Soul?*" we have commenced in this number, and shall finish in the next. We have suggested to him *objections*, his answers to which will appear soon. The novelty of his views should not lead us to slight his argument, which is certainly strongly fortified by Scripture. We have often asked our opponents the question, "What is the Soul?" and as often met with an evasive answer. They talk about its being "*immaterial;*" and they might as well say it is *nothing*. Luther Lee once said, "*it is thought;*" but he gave no evidence except his own "*say so;*" and all immortal-soulists are just as vague and indefinite, which shows they are entirely ignorant as to its nature. "Thought" implies a *thinker*. What is it *thinks?* "The soul," we are told! Well, what is *the soul?* "It is thought!" So, "*thought*" *thinks!* How very "immaterial" that must be! That's *logic*, such as Paul speaks of when he says—"Beware lest any spoil you with vain philosophy after the *tradition* of men," &c.

Whether Br. Pinney has given a more rational and scriptual answer to the question our readers can judge, when he is through.

Br. Pinney is suffering amazingly under a fearful cancer of long standing, and will probably soon "*fall asleep.*" May the Lord sustain him in his last conflict, Jesus and the resurrect

THE TRUE WESLEYA *hilated?*" It made its year ago. Since that seen its face. We hav Examiner after it, with but no tidings have eve leyan. Now we woul *sick, dead,* or ANNIHI "*spirit land?*" Perh the latter. If so, of c *phantasms* to mind Well, we suppose it ca to it.

By the way: we h Advocate and Journal Independent, of this they never show the also sent each of them but they are *mute* as we can learn. What We assure you the Ex dition are no *ghosts. terial* for you. Very easier to be handled; "*beat the air.*" Afte Zion's Herald comme a short time since; with "Rev. N. D. Geo per has disappeared friend Herald?

"HE DIES LIKE A lowing from Zion's H copal paper, Boston, no man could "die lik it should admit such of the M. E. Church. one of the papers in labored to prove that tural." But, here is beast!" He must be we should think. W Br. Herald?

"He dies like a bea while he lived." Tru ral. Not a tear is sh or a want has he reli call him blessed. Th —ye who seek for the centre of every th an epitaph! 'He die good while he lived.'"

l, N. Y., " " 4,00
e, Pa., " " 1,00
Pa., by Geo. Storrs, 5,00
ass., by letter, 3,00
s, by Br. Blain, 12,00
$3; Oswego $6;
er and Utica $3.
places where Br.
nd included in the
pts from him.
g, N. Y., by
R. T. Young, 2,00

ıonth, $64.50

$317,15

reviously rep'ted $276,85
as follows:
- - $12.50
- - 52,65
- - 6,00

ıonth, $71,15

ıts, $348,00

wn, $30,65

s article on the inquiry,
we have commenced in
finish in the next. We
objections, his answers to
ın. The novelty of his
ıs to slight his argument,
ıgly fortified by Scripture.
our opponents the ques-
l?" and as often met with
hey talk about its being
hey might as well say it
once said, "*it is thought;*"
except his own "*say so;*"
sts are just as vague and
s they are entirely igno-
e. "Thought" implies a
thinks? "The soul," we
ıat is *the soul?* "It is
ght" *thinks!* How very
st be! That's *logic*, such
ın he says—"Beware lest
vain philosophy after the

ey has given a more ra-
ıswer to the question our
en he is through.
ering amazingly under a
standing, and will proba-
" May the Lord sustain

him in his last conflict, and bring him, through Jesus and the resurrection, to Life Eternal.

THE TRUE WESLEYAN.—Is that paper "*annihilated?*" It made its *exit* from this city one year ago. Since that time we have not once seen its face. We have several times sent the Examiner after it, with a "*Please Exchange*," but no tidings have ever returned from the Wesleyan. Now we would be glad to know if it is *sick*, *dead*, or ANNIHILATED, or gone into the "*spirit land?*" Perhaps nothing worse than the latter. If so, of course, it is too busy with *phantasms* to mind we *material* creatures.—Well, we suppose it can't be helped, so *farewell* to it.

By the way: we have invited the Christian Advocate and Journal—the Inquirer—and the Independent, of this city, to *exchange;* but they never show their faces to us. We have also sent each of them the Bible vs. Tradition, but they are *mute* as death about it, so far as we can learn. What's the matter, friends?—We assure you the Examiner and Bible vs. Tradition are no *ghosts*. Perhaps they are too *material* for you. Very well—then they are the easier to be handled; for you will not have to "*beat the air.*" After a number of invitations, Zion's Herald commenced an exchange with us a short time since; but since our "Dialogue" with "Rev. N. D. George," last month, that paper has disappeared. What is the matter, friend Herald?

"HE DIES LIKE A BEAST."—We clip the following from Zion's Herald, the Methodist Episcopal paper, Boston, Mass. If it had thought no man could "die like a beast," it seems strange it should admit such a sentiment into an organ of the M. E. Church. This item we found in one of the papers in which Rev. N. D. George labored to prove that "Materialism is Unscriptural." But, here is a man that "dies like a beast!" He must be rather "*material*" then, we should think. What do you think about it, Br. Herald?

"He dies like a beast who hath done no good while he lived." True indeed! Go to his funeral. Not a tear is shed. Not a pain, or a grief, or a want has he relieved, and there is none to call him blessed. Think of it, ye time-servers—ye who seek for pleasure, ye who make self the centre of every thought and action. What an epitaph! 'He died like a beast, for he did no good while he lived.'"

Now, Br. Herald, we are right glad you see things so clearly. May light continue to shine on your path.

Dr. Watts says, in one of his Hymns—"Like brutes they live, like brutes they die;" and it seems the Herald is inclined to the same view, notwithstanding the *nine* articles of Br. N. D. George to prove the contrary. Dr. Watts adds:—

"Like grass they flourish till thy breath
Blast them in *everlasting death.*"

THE HERESY HUNTING.—The case of PROF. MAURICE, dismissed from King's College, England, for the fancied idea that he was heretical on endless torment, is exciting some attention.—The following item is from the *London Daily Times.*

"In compliance with a special demand made by Mr. Maurice, Dr. Jelf has published the whole of the correspondence which passed between himself and the Professor relative to the charge of unsoundness of doctrine which led to his recent dismissal. It appears that the correspondence commenced as far back as July 8, on which day Dr. Jelf addressed a letter to the Professor, in which he stated that his attention had been called by high authority to the conclusion of the last of Mr. Maurice's theological lectures, lately published, and proceeds as follows: 'It is alleged that you therein deny the eternity of future punishment. I have read the essay with attention, and confess that it appears to me to bear that interpretation; at least, the impression it gives seems to throw an atmosphere of doubt on the simple meaning of the word eternal, and to convey a general notion of ultimate salvation for all. I am, of course, most anxious to ascertain your real meaning.' To this letter Mr. Maurice replied on the next day, stating that he believed in the doctrine of eternal punishment, or death, in that sense which seemed to him most consistent with the other uses of the word 'eternal' in the New Testament; but he does not believe in the doctrine in that sense which is given to it, in many popular discourses and theological treatises, and that he repudiates that sense as inconsistent with the Gospel. He adds: 'To state my convictions on this subject was a duty which I felt that I owed to thousands of young Englishmen, whose faith in the redemption of Christ, even in the being of God, is at stake. I could not but tell them, because I believe it is true, that the statements which have led them to identify the God and Father of our Lord with the evil spirit, are not derived from the orthodox faith; that they are a strange product of Calvinism and Locke philosophy, and of the morbid consciousness of individuals.' On the 14th of July, Dr. Jelf wrote to state that the Professor's views filled him with the most intense alarm, and intimated that as the Rev.

gentleman's were, he presumed, official ones, he should lay them before the clerical members of the Council, and if need be, before the Council itself. At length Dr. Jelf decided that the ultimate decision must pass into other hands than his own, and Mr. Maurice was removed from his Professorship, under circumstances with which our readers are already familiar."

PROF. MAURICE has brought out one fact, that is, that the common teaching of *eternal sufferings* for men "*identifies*," in the thinking mind, "God with the *evil spirit*." Nothing could be spoken more truthfully. How long shall the blasphemy continue?

CATHOLICISM.

This *ism*, like all other *isms*, once in a while shows the "*cloven foot*." *The Shepherd of the Valley*, published under the eye and professing to speak with the approbation of the Catholic Bishop of St. Louis, delights in such intimations as these:

"The Church, we admit, is of necessity intolerant; that is, she does everything in her power to check, as effectually as circumstances will admit, the progress of crime and error.—Her intolerance follows necessarily from her claim to infallibility; she alone has the right to be intolerant. Heresy she inserts in her catalogue of mortal sins; she endures it when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energy to effect its destruction. *If the Catholics ever gain, which they surely will do, though at a distant day, an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So say our enemies. So we believe.*"

* * * * *

"We gain nothing by declaring so earnestly against the doctrine of *civil punishment of spiritual crimes*. Our enemies will not believe that we are better than our church, and—for her—her history is before them; they know what she sanctioned during the middle ages, what she did then, and does now where she can; they know, too, what they would do, were they in power; they judge us by themselves. They can reason besides, and when we say *two and two*, they will add, *make four*, whatever we can do to stop them. Heresy is a mortal sin, kills the soul, and sends the entire man, body and soul, to hell; it is, besides, a contagious disease, and affects the interests of unborn millions. Christian kings, believing this, *will crush it in the shell*. Christian States, knowing this, will drive it from their bodies when they can."

"We will say, however, that we are not in favor of roasting heretics, and that, if this sort of work is to be revived—though *in our miserable times it is quite impossible, since men have no belief which they care to propagate, or for which they dare endure*—if persecution is to be renewed, we should rather be its victims than its agents; but we are not, therefore, going to deny the facts of history, or to blame the Saints of God or the Pastors of the Church for what they have done and sanctioned. We say that *the temporal punishment of heresy is a mere question of expediency;* that Protestants do not persecute us here, simply because they have not the power; and that where we abstain from persecuting them, they are well aware that it is merely because we cannot do so, or think that, by doing so, we should injure the cause that we wish to serve."

Such is the spirit of all sectarianism, wherever it is found. No worse in one class of men than another; nor will it die till Christ the Restorer returns from heaven.

WHAT IS THE SOUL?

BY ELD. E. R. PINNEY.

Mark! the question is not, What is *a* Soul; but, What is *the* Soul. A soul is a being—a person. The term *soul* is used by Synecdoche (i. e., a part taken to represent the whole) more frequently in the Scriptures, to represent the entire man, than in any other form. From whence many have inferred and thought, that *the* soul is the entire man. The idea is, to me, extremely absurd, and equivalent to saying that man has no soul. But the Scriptures affirm, that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit, (see 1 Thess. 5 : 23,) which cannot be true if it takes the whole man to constitute the soul.

We often use the head to represent the whole animal—the sail the whole vessel; to wit., 'There are 20 head of cattle passing;' 'Ten sail have arrived in port.' Now we might with as much propriety say, that the head is the whole animal, or the sail the whole vessel, as to affirm that the soul of a man is the whole man. The person who should affirm it of the two former, would be considered a fit inmate of an asylum. And to affirm it of the latter, is contrary to fact, reason, common sense, and revelation. Take from man his soul, and there still remains his body and spirit. So also remove his spirit or breath, and the man remains entire body and soul. But to settle this point, where has God ever said the entire man is the soul? No such declaration can be found.

The question returns upon us, What is *the* soul? There has been 'no end of the making of books,' filled with metaphysical disquisitions and vain speculations as to what constitutes the soul of man or the flesh. But the writers having trusted to their own wisdom, and to 'vain philosophy' instead of seeking wisdom from God, the result has been just what might have been expected—conclusions as various, and errors as numerous as the persons who have written.—How astonishing it is, that men are so unwilling to seek knowledge from God—the only source of true wisdom, especially upon subjects concerning which we are necessarily dependent upon Him for all the light
made man, and made a soul
of course what the soul of m
revealed himself upon the
tion must settle all dispute
point. And here we would
ject has God revealed himse
positively; and yet the m
receive it, but prefer holdin
ditions, or building up ne
the discrepancy of views, w
ed for only from the fact, t
that in the last days the ch
themselves teachers, havir
they shall turn away
truth, and shall be turned
4:3, 4.

In answering this questi
going into a long labored a
in a brief form the Bible v
we would remark, that th
soul in the Old Testament,
is *Nephesh*. There is no
brew that is ever render
some 6 or 8 times. *Neph*
times, and is translated so
is also rendered life some
there is no authority but
theology of these last day
for life, living, &c., is *Chay*
ing Greek term for sou
Zoee. The Hebrew term
The corresponding Greek t
confound the terms soul a
interchangeably, or as sy
there is not the least a
Ruach (spirit) is never
Nephesh (soul) ever rend
entirely dissimilar.

The first time *Nephesh*
in Gen. 1 : 20, and it is
God said, Let the waters
the moving creatures th
word '*life*' has a referen
says, "Heb. Nephesh. He
the 'Bernand' Bible. In
will read simply, "Heb.
have the acknowledgme
persons who made the p
the true rendering of Ne
in the Hebrew is soul.
Hebrew scholars whom
literal rendering of this
ing soul." It would hav
our translators had they
the text, and their comme
how much darkness in th
scholar would have been
God they were honest e
truth even in the marg
correct their errors. In
the terms '*Nephesh Ch*
rendered 'living creatur
verse, we have the sam
30th it is rendered "life
reads, "Heb., a living so
same phrase occurs, appl

on Him for all the light we can have. God made man, and made a soul for man. He knows of course what the soul of man is, and if He has revealed himself upon the subject, that revelation must settle all disputes, and establish the point. And here we would state, upon no subject has God revealed himself more plainly and positively; and yet the mass are unwilling to receive it, but prefer holding on to their old traditions, or building up new theories. Hence, the discrepancy of views, which can be accounted for only from the fact, that God has revealed that in the last days the church would "heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim. 4:3, 4.

In answering this question we do not propose going into a long labored argument, but present in a brief form the Bible view. As preliminary we would remark, that the legitimate term for soul in the Old Testament, or Hebrew Scriptures, is *Nephesh*. There is no other term in the Hebrew that is ever rendered soul except *Nesme* some 6 or 8 times. *Nephesh* is used nearly 700 times, and is translated soul over 450 times. It is also rendered life some 150 times, for which there is no authority but to accommodate the theology of these last days. The Hebrew term for life, living, &c., is *Chayah*. The corresponding Greek term for soul is *Psuche*—for life *Zoee*. The Hebrew term for spirit is *Ruach*.—The corresponding Greek term is *Pneuma*. Many confound the terms soul and spirit, using them interchangeably, or as synonymous; for which there is not the least authority. The term *Ruach* (spirit) is never rendered soul, nor is *Nephesh* (soul) ever rendered spirit. They are entirely dissimilar.

The first time *Nephesh* is found in the Bible is in Gen. 1:20, and it is rendered life. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath LIFE." The word '*life*' has a reference to the margin which says, "Heb. Nephesh. Heb. Soul." I am using the 'Bernand' Bible. In most Bibles the margin will read simply, "Heb. Soul." Here, then we have the acknowledgment of the 47 learned persons who made the present translation that the true rendering of Nephesh, and its meaning in the Hebrew is soul. To this agree all the Hebrew scholars whom I have consulted. The literal rendering of this passage is, "reptile living soul." It would have been more modest in our translators had they placed God's word in the text, and their comments in the margin; and how much darkness in the mind of the English scholar would have been avoided. But I thank God they were honest enough to give us the truth even in the margin, which enables us to correct their errors. In the next verse, (21st) the terms '*Nephesh Chayah*,' occurs, and is rendered 'living creature;' so also in the 24th verse, we have the same rendering. In verse 30th it is rendered "life;" but in the margin reads, "Heb., a living soul." In Gen 2:7, the same phrase occurs, applied to man, and is rendered, living soul; from which many argue that man has an immortal soul. But mark! we have already seen that the same terms, "*nephesh chayah*" (living soul) are applied to beasts, birds, and creeping things, four times before it is to man at all; besides the term in the Old Testament is never applied to man but once, whereas it is applied to the animal creation twelve times, (if my memory serves me). So that if it proves man's immortality, much more does it also the beasts. This fact accounts for the different renderings. They believed in the immortality of the soul; hence, when the term *nephesh* was applied to the beasts of the sea, (in vs. 20 and 21,) they rendered it life,* creature, &c.; for had they rendered it soul, it would have made the beasts also immortal.

In the New Testament, when speaking of the destruction of the beasts of the sea, they are termed *living souls*. See Rev. 16:3. "And every LIVING SOUL in the sea died." Let it then be remembered, that we have the authority of the 47 translators of the English Bible—the inspired commentary of the New Testament, as well as the Hebrew scholars of the present day, for rendering and reading the term *nephesh* 'soul;' although it may be rendered in the text 'life.' With these remarks we pass directly to the question, "What is the soul?"

God permitted Noah, after the flood, to add to his food the flesh of beasts. In giving directions for eating it, he says: "But flesh with the *nephesh* (soul) thereof which IS THE BLOOD thereof shall ye not eat." Here we have the declaration of God himself, that the blood is the soul. And it is not a forced construction; no other can be put upon it, for it is a simple, plain declaration, as to the manner of eating meat; given in the most literal terms. In the next verse (5th) the terms blood and soul are used interchangeably as follows: "And surely your BLOOD of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the *nephesh* (soul) of man." Wherefore is added (v. 6th) "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

The same instruction for eating flesh is given in Deut. 12:23. "Only BE SURE that thou eat not the blood: for THE BLOOD IS THE NEPHESH (soul), and thou mayest not eat the *nephesh* (soul) with the flesh." We find the same prohibition in the gospel, where the council of Apostles and Elders were called upon to settle the question of circumcision. They required that

* I will give an instance or two illustrating the inconsistent and absurd renderings of Nephesh.—In Gen. 1:20, they rendered it 'life.' Then to have been consistent they should have rendered it in the next verse 'living life,' instead of 'living creature.' Again, in v. 30, they render 'Nephesh chayah' 'life;' then in 2:7, where the same phrase occurs they should have rendered it, 'man became a life,' instead of 'man became a living soul.' These examples show the inconsistencies into which men will be led who depart from the truth to accommodate a theory.

they "abstain from things strnagled, and from blood, &c." (Acts 15 : 29.) See also Lev. 3 : 17 ; 7 : 26, 27 ; 17 : 16, &c., where we are taught that the penalty for eating blood was death. Query. Why this restriction laid upon eating blood, in both Testaments, with a penalty so severe?—Because, says God, "it is the SOUL of all flesh," and because, "I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your persons." The term soul here is used by synecdoche to represent the whole man, and may be rendered persons.

Lev. 17 : 13, 14. "And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth or catcheth any beast or fowl that may be eaten ; he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust." And the reason follows. Mark! "For it is the *nephesh* (soul) of ALL FLESH ; the blood of it (the flesh) IS FOR THE SOUL (nephesh) THEREOF : therefore (for this reason) I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall not eat the blood of no manner of flesh ; for the *nephesh* (soul) of all flesh is the blood thereof : whosoever eateth it shall be cut off."

In this last verse we are not only twice told that "the blood is the soul of all flesh," but in a third sentence, informed that it is given (i. e., created by God) expressly "FOR THE SOUL OF THE FLESH." What can be more plain, explicit and positive than this testimony from the Scriptures? Six plain literal declarations that "THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL," and given under circumstances that positively forbid any other construction. It is inconceivable how God could have revealed himself more intelligibly upon the point ; and how astonishing that it could ever have been overlooked or misapprehended! And what an illustration of the truth of Paul's prophecy, that "in the last days * * * their ears shall be turned away from the truth and be turned unto fables."

The point being fully established that the blood is *the* soul, and so designed by the great Architect, we are prepared to draw conclusions with some degree of safety as to its attributes. I used to say to my brethren when discussing these points, Tell me what the soul is, and then I can judge whether it is immaterial, immortal, &c., as well as you. It was this consideration, in connection with the fact, that God had used the term, in his revelation to man, more than 800 times, that led me to resolve on searching the Scriptures, until I found out what the soul was. For I could not believe God would use a term so many times, so important to know what it was in order to understand that revelation, without somewhere revealing plainly what it was. And thank God, my search was not in vain. I now have no more doubt as to what part of me is my soul, than what part of me is my head or foot. The one is as plainly revealed as the other, and if God is not to be believed in the one case, neither is he in the other.

From the above premises we conclude—

1st. That the soul is material, otherwise it could not be eaten.

2nd. Being material, and a part of the man which the "Lord God formed out of the dust of the ground"—of "the earth earthy," it must in due time die and return to the dust from whence it came. Thus the Scriptures everywhere teach that the entire man, both soul and body dies.—Paul says, (1 Cor. 15 : 44) "It is sown a natural body." The word here rendered 'natural' is *Psuchikon*, the adjective of the noun *Psuche*, the legitimate (and only) word for *soul* in the Greek ; hence literally rendered would be "sown (dies) a *soulical* body," (i. e., a body animated by blood). "It is raised a spiritual body," (i. e., a body animated by spirit). This will enable us to understand v. 50th, in which he says,—"Flesh and blood (i. e., flesh animated by blood) cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and the reason follows immediately. "neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Our inheritance is to be incorruptible ; [see 1 Pet. 1 : 4] hence, instead of having a body animated by blood, which is corruptible and mortal, we must have a spiritual body—be born again, incorruptible. Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit," [1 Pet. 3 : 18] and God has promised to quicken our mortal bodies by the same spirit that raised Christ from the dead, Rom. 8 : 11—whereby we are fitted to inherit the incorruptible kingdom. Christ's soul died—He made "his soul an offering for sin." "He poured out his soul unto death." Isa. 53 : 10, 12. Body and soul both went into the grave—Ps. 16 : 10, compared with Acts 2 : 31—and was redeemed from the power of the grave, that is, death, Ps. 49 : 15—which could not have been unless the soul had first died. Hence,

3rd. The soul is not immortal, for whatever is immortal cannot die.

4th. Consequently is not capable of existence or consciousness out from and independent of the body.

5th. Then all theories built upon the hypothesis of the soul's immortality, immateriality, and conscious existence, independent of the body, are fables, and not according to truth.

[*To be Continued*]

FROM A. N. SEYMOUR.

Addison, Mich.

BR. STORRS.—Through the goodness of God I am still permitted to hold up from time to time the glorious and sublime *theme* of *Eternal Life* and its attending *realities* through *Jesus Christ alone*. And if there is any consolation to be enjoyed. I enjoy it when I am holding up the truth which we have been called to embrace—and which shines so gloriously around our pathway. For your encouragement, and that of others of like precious faith, I would say that the cause is assuming a very favorable aspect in this vicinity, which is a new field of labor. We came here early last spring, and have done what we could to extend the knowledge of the *life theme* in connection with other subjects. We are satisfied that our labor has not been in vain ; for a goodly number have become settled

in the truth of no immortality out of Christ, and also in the faith generally; among whom are some talented men, capable of defending the truth with any one; viz., Br. Nelson Green, a member of the M. E. Church, and for two or three years a member of the legislature: also, a Br. Sandford, formerly connected with the Methodist Church, but latterly with the Christians. He improves in public and has done so for a number of years past. He loves the truth dearly, and his conversion to the life theme has wrought a most glorious change in his affections. He can now see beauty, harmony, sublimity, and loveliness in the character of God which cause him to love him with much more ardor than he did while believing that God would hold countless millions of human beings in liquid fire, and there wreak his vengeance on them by *torturing* them eternally. In connexion with these is a Br. Stone, a professor and principal teacher in a chartered institution about three miles from us. Br. Stone is an able man in argument--sometimes speaks in public. As ministers of different denominations come to the institution to preach he takes the opportunity of correcting them when they wander from the truth. I sold him the Bible vs. Tradition; he read it through, comparing it with the original—he values it highly, and recommends it as an excellent work. My Brother, the cause which we are sustaining I am perfectly satisfied is of the Lord, and prosper it must and will; though wave after wave of opposition may dash against and threaten to overwhelm us, yet we shall arise by the help of God and overthrow the greatest and most pernicious of heathenish errors—the doctrine of the Immortality of the soul: and when that falls in the minds of men they must build on Christ for salvation or perish.

From M. Batchelor.

Pownal, Vt.

Br. Storrs.—I rejoice that in these last days I have learned to read God's precious will as he has given it unto us. Formerly we thought about all of it must be spiritualized. It was spiritual life, spiritual death, spiritnal tree of life, and spiritual heaven. But when I take the Bible to read, and feel I have a true history of what has been and what shall be, how plain it is. It begins with man on earth, and all pronounced good. Sin entered, and death and loss of earth followed. Christ brought life and immortality to light, and offers it to man with the promises that he shall inherit the earth. And as I read the precious book of God to the end, there I see earth restored from its curse, man risen up, and under Christ takes possession of the kingdom and dominion under the whole heavens. Now, if the future is to be understood figurative, the past history must be also figurative; but a sane mind can not thus interpret the past history. Then as certainly as there is a heaven for the saints in the promise it has an earth to it. Then if life, immortally on earth restored, is the christian's portion, as promised in the gospel, those that reject the gospel will have neither life nor place after the judgment. Thus Psalm 52: 5, will be literally fulfilled, with a host of others of the same class. From this conclusion I arrive at another, that is, there will be a time when sin and suffering will cease in all the vast universe of God. *Amen.* Then sinners will not be, as John Brown said in his catechism—"cursing, roaring, and blaspheming God for all eternity." (Horrible!) The plan of God, when completed, will destroy all that makes discord; then all his works shall praise him. With this view of things, how can we help praying, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." I do rejoice that we are so near the opening scenes, when Jesus the restorer will appear. Truly the signs are ominous. Even so come, Lord Jesus. *Amen.*

From W. H. Fernald.

Lawrence, Mass., Dec. 13, 1853.

Br. Storrs—I am pleased to learn that there is some prospect of the Exrs. semi-monthly visits to this city, and you will find me a ready supporter of any such measure as is suggested in the last number of your paper.

I am reading "*The Conflict of Ages*," By E. Beacher. He certainly reasons well; and I can not see how it can be possible for any, who entertain the popular notions concerning man, to avoid his conclusions. "*Bible vs. Tradition*" will be a capital work to place in the hands of as many as read the "Conflict," &c. What a pity that Mr. B. did not get on the right track. His logical power seemed equal to that of "Dobney." And when I behold stars of such apparent magnitude, it is painful to be obliged to consider them of no more importance than a "jack-o'-lantern." Still, to those who know from whence they originated, the "will-o'-the-wisp" is a valuable servant, since it indicates with the utmost certainty the region of *mist, mire and corruption*, (to all of which it is indebted for its luminous appearance,) and kindly admonishes them if they would escape the danger of being swamped at last, to keep off a proper distance. But then it is to be lamented that there are those—and the number is by no means small—who will not be thus admonished; who being highly pleased with the mellow light which eminates from this phantom of Mr. B.'s, will eagerly pursue it until grasping it, intent on making it their own, the light suddenly vanishes; when, finding themselves in a dense wilderness and darkness, thick as the mire under their feet, every effort to escape iuvolves them in more certain ruin. At length, with jack-o'-lantern, they sink to rise no more.

The possibility of such results ought to awaken in us a strong desire for the salvation of our fellow-men.

The doctrines made prominent in the Exr. we think the best calculated to awaken an interest in the hearts of sinners for their salvation of any with which we are acquainted. And for this reason I desire it to be more widely circulated.

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day. *Price*, 75 cents. For $5, *ten* copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where $1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

"THEOLOGY OF PAUL; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul;* by H. L. Hastings." A pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo. Price, *six cents* single; or $4 per 100. It is a valuable and convincing work. Let it be put into the hands of every man and woman in city and country.

"LIFE AND DEATH; or, The Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality; by Rev. J. Panton Ham," Bristol, England. Also,

"THE GENERATIONS GATHERED AND GATHERING; or, The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death," by the same author.

These works are each published in a double Examiner, with covers. Price, *ten cents* single copy: or $7 per hundred. Without charge to all *Preachers* who will read them. Let them continue to be scattered.

"DEATH NOT LIFE; or, *The Theological Hell and Enaless Misery Disproved, by a Collection and Explanation of all the Passages on Future Punishment; also, The Metaphysical Arguments for the Immortality of the Wicked Exploded.* By Jacob Blain, Baptist Minister, of Buffalo, N. Y."

This is a pamphlet of 120 pages, 12 mo.; price 25 cents single; or $16 per 100. Many hundreds have been scattered. It is a two-edged sword. Let it be sent into every corner of the land.

"DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT," by *Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff*, Scotland. This work is calculated to interest and instruct on the subject of immortality. Many of them have been circulated in this country. It is a 12 mo. pamphlet of 60 pages, and has been sold at 15 cents; but we have concluded to *reduce* the price to *ten* cents single; and $6 per 100. We have just published a *new* edition.

"THE BIBLE STUDENT'S CONCORDANCE; *by which the English reader may be enabled readily to ascertain the literal meaning of any word in the sacred original;* By AARON PICK, *Professor of Hebrew and Chaldee, from the University of Prague.*"

This work we have had occasion to speak of several times in the past few years. Though it is not all that we desire to help a mere English scholar, yet it is a most valuable auxiliary in the study of the Old Testament Scriptures. It gives every word of the *Hebrew* Testament; first in the Hebrew letters, then the English name of each word, after which follows the literal sense of the word. Last of all is given every place, chapter and verse, where each word occurs.

We mention this work now simply to say, that we found a few copies in Philadelphia lately, after having sought in vain for it in this city.—It costs near $10 when ordered of the importers; but we can furnish 3 or 4 copies at $5 per copy, if desired; but the purchaser would have to pay the expense from Philadelphia to the place where it might be ordered.

HYMN BOOK.—After a suspense of six months, or more, we have just received the compilation of Hymns published by J. Panton Ham, Bristol, England. It is the third copy Br. Ham has sent us—the two previous never having come to hand; and the one now received has been just three months, to a day, on the way; but we are glad to get it at last. So far as we have been able to examine it, we like it much. It is what a Hymn Book should be—made up of *Praise* mainly. We have not yet fully decided in the matter, but we are inclined to think we shall republish this book nearly entire. It contains about 300 Hymns, well chosen. Br. Ham says, "A portion of the Hymns have never before been published, having been written expressly for this collection;" and he "feels that public thanks are due to the Rev. W. Glen Moncrieff, of Edinburg, for his kind aid in reviewing the hymns for the press, as well as for some poetical and Scriptural contributions to the work."

DEFERRED ARTICLES AND LETTERS.—We intended to have given a number of articles and letters in this number which are laid over, as we had filled up our columns before we were aware of it. Br. Grew and others shall find a place soon, and we will try to say less *ourself* next time, to give them room. The next Examiner will appear as near the 15th inst. as possible.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1854. NO. 2.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street.
TERMS.--One Dollar for the Year;
Always in Advance.

GEO STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

Continued from page 181, *Vol.* 8.]

BESIDES the voice of prayer, the cry of bitter complaint breaks upon our ear from the great Sufferer on the cross. In the anguish of approaching dissolution the dying Jesus exclaims, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" and this exclamation has been supposed to imply that at that moment God was judicially restraining his "consolatory support, so that the consolations might not take off any part of the keen edge of his passion; and this was necessary to make his sufferings meritorious." So surmises Dr. Adam Clark, for he cannot admit that there was such an actual forsaking on the part of God as to leave Christ destitute of the presence of Divinity in some sense, for that "would deprive his sacrifice of its *infinite merit*, and consequently leave the sin of the world without an atonement. Take *deity* away," he writes, "from any redeeming act of Christ, and redemption is ruined." He suggests but with evident misgivings, that the words might be translated, "My God! My God! to what sort of persons hast thou left me?" The language of this complaint, though popularly employed to prove that Christ on the cross was the object of his Father's wrath, was clearly seen by the learned commentator to involve considerable critical difficulties on that theory, and he leaves the subject, as he does many others, burdened sufficiently with learned criticism, but without reflecting any light on its acknowledged obscurity. To us, this cry of anguish seems eminently natural under the circumstances of Christ as previously explained. The complaint that he was *forsaken* by his Father, must be shut up indeed to the necessity of a rendering, to oblige the belief that he was *judicially* forsaken. The reader is requested to bear in mind, that it is an integrant part of the common doctrine, that the Lord Jesus Christ came into the world for the specific purpose of expiating the world's sins, by bearing its punishment, and giving a full moral satisfaction to the claims of Divine justice. To die on the cross was, in the popular apprehension, the grand reason of his incarnation and mission. Theological writers and preachers of the so-called orthodox school, affirm that Christ's expiatory death was the subject of stipulation between him and his Father; that it was previously arranged and settled in the eternal counsels; and that it constitutes both the reason and righteousness of human redemption. In the view of this theory, then, Christ's interrogatory complaint on the cross, so far from illustrating and confirming it, presents a phenomenon altogether discordant and inexplicable. We have said on an earlier page, that if the popular interpretation of the last sufferings and death of our Lord be the true one, it will appear to be borne out by all the historic circumstances of the crucifixion, that everything said and done on that awful event, especially by our Lord himself, if it do not decidedly indicate its judicial character, will at least not tend to obscure its terrible significance by investing it with an altogether different aspect. But hitherto, we have been unable to penetrate the vail of circumstances which congregate around the cross, so as to discover such a significance in the sufferings of the dying Jesus, which the "churches" assure us those sufferings had. To us it is a most unaccountable phenomenon, that the evangelical portraiture of Christ on the cross exhibits a strange *unconsciousness* in him, that he was the subject of his Father's judicial displeasure, and that, he was bearing the burden, for expiation's sake, of the world's punishment. Is it not an additional argument to what we have hitherto advanced against the *popular* cross as the true representation of the cross of Christ, that, in the agony of dissolution, when he seemed to be bearing the severest burden of his mortal anguish, he should exclaim, "My God! My God! *why hast thou forsaken me?*" Here is the language of most painful surprise. The great Sufferer was conscious of an unusual loneliness, as if his Father, who had so graciously sent an angel to strengthen him in a former extremity, were now leaving him to bear this mortal anguish alone; and he asks in the language of evident astonishment, the reason of this terrible solitude, "My God! My God! WHY hast thou forsaken me?" Now, according to the general opinion concerning the death of Christ, we should not have expected to hear such language from the cross. Are we to suppose, that he, who came into the world specially to bear the world's punishment, and give a satisfaction

for sins by the sufferings on the cross, *did not know why* he was forsaken of his Father? If it were a fact, that God was angry with his Son as the criminal representative of our guilty race, and that Christ *knew* this, then *why did he ask the reason of this displeasure?* Was not such a question, at such a time, adapted to obscure the alleged judicial significance of the sufferings on the cross? According to the popular theology, it is of first consequence that the expiatory nature of those sufferings should be distinctly recognized as the only ground of acceptance with God, and yet *the historic account of those sufferings represents Christ himself as an entire stranger to any such significance!* Surely, if the sufferings of Christ had been for such a purpose as is popularly believed, it would not be unreasonable to expect that on such a question being asked by our Lord, a voice would come from heaven declaring, in distinct terms, the reason why God had then forsaken his Son. A supernatural voice distinguished Jesus at his baptism, and on the occasion of his transfiguration: was it a less important occasion when hanging on the cross he called aloud for an explanation of his desertion in death? If the popular notions of Christ's crucifixion be correct, then this was beyond all the most important moment of his history, and this question one of deepest and most indispensable interest. More especially important does this dying query of our Lord become, because it represents *him* as a *stranger* to the cause of his conscious desertion of God. Yet no explanatory voice responds to the mysterious complaint.—no messenger from heaven challenges the world's audience while he unravels the awful mystery, that the crucified One was judicially forsaken by God, because he was then in the attitude of the sinner's substitute, and enduring the merited desert of the sinner's guilt. Without presumption, we may venture to say, that as the Bible nowhere expressly states that Christ *expiated* the sins of men on the cross.—that he bore their *punishment*,—and gave for them a *judicial satisfaction*;—as neither the prophets,—nor our Lord himself,—nor his apostles ever say anything of this kind, then it was the more to be expected that some clear declaration would be given on the occasion of the crucifixion itself, if these purposes were really answered by that solemn event. That Christ should *express astonishment* in the endurance of his great sufferings,—that he should *ask the reason* of his desertion,—and that no *response* should be made, is to us an additional testimony against the construction which the popular theology puts on the sufferings of the crucifixion.

In our view of the history of Christ, there never was a moment's interruption of that profoundly pure harmony which subsisted from the first between Him and his Father. The scheme of theology which represents Christ as the subject of an artificial arrangement, in accordance with which he should take upon himself all the personal responsibilities, not of one individual, but of a world of individuals, and form a compact with them for a mutual transfer of character and consequences on certain conditions, seems to us to be neither true in reason, nor taught in revelation. As we read the Sacred History, and the doctrinal writings of the Apostles of Christianity, we find not the faintest allusion to any such fiction as this. We never meet with a single indication of displeasure on the part of the Father towards his well-beloved Son, in whom he always appears to us to be "well pleased." Not even does this complaint on the cross—this obvious sense of desertion by his Father, necessitate our belief that Christ was deserted in displeasure even representatively. We may not be able to explain the nature of that experience, and those painful emotions which stimulated the suffering One so to expostulate with his Father; but the very fact that he should expostulate—that he should ask "*why*"—"*why* hast thou forsaken me?" is itself a proof that between Jesus and his Father even then there was the closest and most blessed intimacy. We ask our readers to realize the circumstances of the dying Jesus. His disciples had all "forsook him and fled;" none will doubt that he was as sensible as the most sensitive to this abandonment by his disciples, who had been his constant friends and companions. The intense humanity of Christ, allowed nothing to be indifferent to him which was not indifferent to others of the human family. If it is natural to be pained at the desertion of beloved friends, then was Christ pained when his disciples left him to suffer and die alone. He looked forward to this act of desertion, and spoke of it, when he said to his disciples on the evening of his betrayal, "all ye shall be offended because of me this night—for it is written, (even prophecy had foretold it), I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." Bearing in mind that the sense of desertion by his followers was among the painful experiences of Christ's dying hour, and that no extraordinary manifestations of the presence of his Father were given then as in Gethsemane, the complaint of Christ has a most touching and natural significance. It is as if he had said, "though my disciples have forsaken me, this I can bear, for I know the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak; but that *Thou*, O my Father, shouldst give no manifestation of thy presence—that *Thou* shouldst leave me, as any other of thy children, to bear this bitter burden so consciously alone, it is this I feel so keenly—"My God! My God! *why* hast THOU forsaken me?" That sense of his Father's desertion appears to us a most natural experience; for if Christ had been supported throughout his sufferings by extraordinary, supernatural aids, he would not have known the common experience of mankind, and could not on account of such common experience, have been "touched with the feeling of our infirmities." In being left to the natural experience of painful sufferings—and to know the bitter loneliness of death, he has "*borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.*" He, no more than others of the human family, has been

exempted from the painful contingencies of mortality; nay, he has known more of them, for his life was a more comprehensive one, it took into its wonderful circumference a greater circle of human experiences, and hence his greater qualifications as the exemplar and succorer of our race.

We may be permitted to suggest a few thoughts, with the view of explaining some of the probable causes of our Lord's sense of desertion by his Father.

The Evangelist informs us, that "about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" and that "when he had cried again with a loud voice he yielded up the ghost." It was therefore, in the last extremity, just as he was about to expire, that this cry of distress was uttered. "The sorrows of death compassed him, and the pains of Sheol gat hold upon him," and in the unutterable bitterness of that moment's experience, he felt as if forsaken by his Father. For the time being, it was an actual forsaking of him by God, not in displeasure, nor for any judicial purpose; but because God would leave his well-beloved Son, as all his other sons, to the consequences of their fidelity, painful as those consequences might be. He would not interrupt the course of painful events—his Son, as well as the race he came to restore, should be "perfected through sufferings." God left his Son to die, and that holy Son felt that he was so left, and the agony of that experience extorted the bitter cry, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" Such an exclamation is, in our opinion, a testimony to the fellowship of Christ with his Father even to the last. That he should address his Father not in the vocative of a cold distance, but with the possessive pronoun of endeared relationship indicates this, "*My* God! *My* God!" &c. It is, moreover, a testimony to his purity, for the surprise expressed in his language implies that his terrible experience was not merited on his own account, and that in submitting to it, he had yielded to a painful contingence of his mission as the exemplifier of a perfect righteousness in a sinful and death-doomed world. He "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." "Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being made perfect, (through suffering,) he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." He has shown mankind how to suffer, as the recompense, in this world, of obedience to God. He has taught them how "to resist unto blood, striving against sin,"—and thus, "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin (not as a *charge* against mankind, but as a quality of their personal *character*) by the sacrifice of himself."

It would be presumptuous to endeavor to analyze the painful consciousness of the dying Saviour at this awful moment of his sufferings; but we may well conceive that those sufferings were what they could not be to any other being but himself. To know something of the "curse" character of death, belongs to all our mortal race. To shrink from it as an "enemy" is our common experience, and natural to our life-loving instincts. But in Christ how intense must have been the emotions of horror and aversion with which he would sink under the hateful power of death! The Psalmist expresses these emotions, when speaking in the name of his royal Son, he says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol!" So, too, that touching communication to the disciples, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death,"—and especially that agonizing scene in Gethsemane, when he exclaimed, "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," and when "his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground." Paul explained the phenomenon when he tells us that Christ "in the days of his flesh offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to him that was able to save him from *death*." The Lord Jesus Christ "knew no sin," and death is "the wages of sin;"—how natural then, that *he* should shrink with an unusual horror from its actual experience. Death to him would be peculiarly hateful in this aspect. As "the Holy One of God," Christ would experience in death what no human being can now understand, much less participate in. Viewed in connection with sin, to which death is indissolubly allied, the mortal anguish of Christ must have been peculiarly and inconceivably intense; in itself sufficient to account for that agonizing complaint, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

Add to this that Christ is emphatically "the Life,"—that it is his mysterious prerogative to declare, "I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive again for evermore;"—that before he came into our world he lived in the communion of the life of God;—what then must have been the strength of *his* life sympathies,—and with what peculiarly painful emotions would *he* feel the powerful grasp of grim Death. If *our* life instincts are so strong, what must Christ's be? If *we* shrink with so much horror from death, with how much greater horror would he? The death of Christ was not the death of an ordinary being. As "that holy thing" which was begotten miraculously of God, and as the "quickening" or life-giving "Spirit," his death, like his birth, is involved in profoundest mystery. Other men have met death in some of its most terrific and excruciating forms with a firmness more than human, while Christ, in a less agonizing death than theirs, expressed, both in its anticipation and experience, the most insufferable anguish. But the *form* of death, we may be permitted to suppose, was less a concern to Christ than the *fact* of death. Had the means of death been even more torturing than they were, probably *no more* emotion would have expressed itself, the index of an equally intense suffering in the conscious experience of the dying Christ. In our opinion, it was *death itself*, without so much regard to its *form*, that occasioned the chief anguish in the sufferings of

the crucifixion;—which explains the remarkable dread with which Christ looked forward to, and endured it; and which stimulated the expiring cry, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?" Others we know, have considered this manifest dread as the evidence that Christ was shrinking from the awful experience of his voluntary substitution,—as the representative of sinners, and their proxy for the endurance of their punishment; but in the face of so many irreconcilable facts, we cannot accept this theory, and find no occasion to resort to it for the explanation of this additional phenomenon on the cross. Taking into consideration *who* Christ was, and that he was in the *act of dying*, we find no difficulty, and certainly no discrepancy with our theory, in the utterance of his expiring complaint, "My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me?"

[*To be Continued.*]

WHAT IS THE SOUL?

BY ELD. E. R. PINNEY.

[*Continued from page* 14.]

Our second argument is from

GOD'S PLAN OF REDEMPTION.

Aside from the plain declarations of the word already presented, the truth that the blood is the soul may be further demonstrated from God's plan for the redemption of man, as revealed in his Word. Man, in consequence of disobedience, was brought under the condemnation of the law. The penalty of that law was death—death of the entire man. How readest thou? "In the day THOU eatest thereof (Marg. and Heb.) dying THOU SHALT DIE." (Gen. 2: 17). In the text it reads, "Thou shalt surely die," but this is man's gloss, and is not true. For it is certain that Adam did not die in the day that he ate of the forbidden fruit; and it is equally certain, that not only 'in the day,' but the very moment he ate, he was in a dying, corruptible state—he began to die, and, in process of time, died. Hence, I understand the expression, "Dying thou shalt die," as follows:—That by eating of the forbidden tree, Adam would introduce into his system (which was created pure and incorruptible, *i. e.* having no seeds of corruption in itself) seeds of corruption and decay; the effect of which would be to place him in a decaying and dying condition, which condition would result in certain death.

That the Hebrew text, and this view of it is correct, is evident from God's own interpretation of the penalty, and the Bible history of the facts in the case. Proof, Gen. 3: 19. "In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, TILL THOU return unto the ground, for out of it wast *thou* taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 6: 5. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and HE DIED."

This interpretation, and result as given in the Word, is however, very different from the teachings of the orthodoxy of these last days. And I will give this text, and the other two, in which are contained the law-penalty, in contrast, that you may perceive the difference as they read in the text, and are interpreted by our teachers of the present day.

Bible.	*Orthodoxy.*
"In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." Gen. 2: 17.	"In the day that thou eatest thereof dying thou shalt never die.
"The soul that sinneth, IT shall die." Ezekiel 18: 4.	The soul that sinneth it shall live forever, and be tormented in a lake that burneth with fire and brimstone.
"The wages of sin is death." Romans 6: 23.	The wages of sin is eternal life in misery.

Hence, we are told that men do not actually die, but the righteous at death go into happiness, and the wicked into misery, awaiting the judgments. But to return to our subject.

Again, God said to Adam, "Dying THOU shalt die"—"If THOU eat"—"In the sweat of thy face shalt THOU eat"—"From dust THOU art," &c. Now, I ask, does not the *thou* include the whole man? If not, what part is exempt? Do you say, the soul? Then I would ask you a few questions. Can a man without a soul eat? Can he be a living, conscious, intelligent, and accountable being, without a soul? If you answer affirmatively, then I ask, if the soul does not impart life, nor consciousness, nor intelligence, nor accountability, what is the use of having a soul? If you answer negatively, then you yield the whole ground, and the *soul* is included in the *thou* that was to die; hence, the soul dies. For man at this time had a soul. God had pronounced him "a living soul." (See Gen. 2: 7). He was an intelligent, accountable being on probation; for it was on the condition of his eating that the penalty of death was to be inflicted.

The law recognizes the *soul* as guilty, and requires its death as necessary to satisfy its claims. Proof: "Behold, all souls are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the *soul that sinneth* IT (the soul) SHALL DIE." Ezek. 18: 4. The law knows no mercy. Its claims must be met. Justice will and must be satisfied. Man could not redeem himself, God therefore gave his Son, who came to suffer for us. He satisfied the claims of the law, or as Paul says, (Gal. 3: 13,) "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." If so, then Christ's SOUL DIED, for the curse of the law resting upon us, was the death of the soul. Hence, if Christ's *soul* did not die, the law is not satisfied—our hopes of salvation are vain—we must suffer the penalty—our souls must die.

The question then arises, Did Christ's soul die? On this hangs all our hope of salvation—"To the law and the testimony: for if we speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in us." Jesus says, (Math. 20: 28.) "The Son of Man came * * * to give his SOUL (Psuche) a ranson for many." Isaiah 53: 12, "He (Christ) POURED OUT HIS SOUL UNTO DEATH;" then his soul died. Again, tenth verse, "Thou (God) shalt make his (Christ's) SOUL an offering for sin." Psalms 16: 10,

"Thou wilt not leave my SOUL in *sheol*, (the grave) neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." Peter in his comments on this passage, in Acts 2: 30, 31, says it refers to Christ and was fulfilled in his resurrection from the dead. For "God had sworn with an oath to David, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne. He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his SOUL was not left in the grave (Hades*) neither his FLESH did see corruption." How could his soul be left in the grave if it never went there?

Again, "But God will redeem my SOUL from the power of the grave." Psalm 49: 15. What is the power of the grave? Death. How could Christ's soul (for David here personifies Christ) be delivered from the power of death unless it had first died? It could not; therefore Christ's soul died and went into the grave with his flesh or body. But God raised him from the dead, and by his resurrection hath begotten us again unto a hope of life, and a kingdom. For, inasmuch, as there is no mercy in the law, but for the resurrection, death would (as the French infidels proclaimed) be an "eternal sleep!" And thus Paul reasons when he says, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which have FALLEN ASLEEP IN CHRIST ARE PERISHED." Query, How can this be, if (as we are told by many) when the body dies, the soul—the man proper—goes direct into heaven, where he has more life, and intelligence, &c., than ever? Please answer.

Again the apostle says, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." Hence, he adds (verse 32). "What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink (i. e. make the best we can of this world) for to-morrow we die;" and that ends the matter. But "thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." God "laid help upon one who was mighty," even the Lion of the tribe of Judah, who through his resurrection prevailed, and "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." He lives, and ever lives; and because he lives we shall live also, and reign with him in glory, forever. Amen.

From the foregoing array of Scripture, it is evident that Christ has satisfied the demands of the law, thereby making reconciliation for iniquity, and purchasing man's redemption. Now I ask, What was it that satisfied the claims of the law—what paid the price of our redemption? Whatever it was, determines what the soul is; for the penalty of the law was the death of the soul. The prophet says, (Isaiah 53: 10, 12.) the SOUL was offered to atone for sin. "His SOUL was *poured out* unto death." What was it that was poured out—that atoned? I answer, It was the blood of Christ. Proof: "Forasmuch as ye know that we were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, * * * but with the precious BLOOD OF CHRIST." 1 Peter 1: 18. Again, "Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast REDEEMED us to God by thy BLOOD." Rev. 5: 9. "For without shedding of BLOOD there is no remission of sins." Heb. 9: 22. "In Christ we have REDEMPTION through his BLOOD." Eph. 1: 7. "THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST HIS SON CLEANSETH us from all sin." 1 John 1: 7. "Unto Him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his OWN BLOOD, to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1: 5, 6. Hence the necessity of Christ's coming by BLOOD as well as by water, and John's particularity in repeating it. "This is he that came by water and BLOOD, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and BLOOD." 1 John 5: 6. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and BLOOD, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. 2: 14.

More evidence might be given upon this point, but this will suffice to the believer in God's Word, and more would not convince the skeptic. Paul said, in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established. Here are eight. And now I ask in all candor, if we can desire any thing to be revealed in plainer terms than the following points?

1st. That the blood is the soul.

2nd. That Christ by his blood atoned for sin and purchased our redemption.

3d. That consequently Christ's soul died, which alone could release us from the claims of the Law; consequently, the soul is mortal as well as the body.

These are solemn and glorious truths. And it is time they were understood and believed and confessed, that men may see that in Christ alone is redemption THROUGH HIS BLOOD. My impenitent friend, be entreated to flee to Christ, and trust in his blood, which alone can cleanse you from the guilt of sin, and present you faultless before the throne of God. Believe, O, believe that Christ is able, and willing, and will save you, that you may rejoice with a joy unspeakable and full of glory, through the hope wrought

---

* The Greek term *Hades*, and the corresponding Hebrew term sheol, are invariably used to represent the place of the dead—the grave. Neither word has the first shade of the idea of misery or torment connected with it. So also our English word 'HELL' has no idea of misery attached to it. Dr. Clark says, *hell* comes from the Saxon verb '*helan*', to cover or hide; hence the tiling or slating of a house is called in Cornwall, (England), *heling*, to this day; and in Lancashire the *covers* of books are so called. The translators of our Bible doubtless meant by HELL, a covered or unseen place; the grave, or place of the dead; making it synonymous with *hades* and *sheol*: never intending it to represent a place of conscious suffering. That is an idea attached by the false teachers of these days, and for which there is no authority but theological.

in you by faith unto eternal life, and glory and a kingdom. Amen.

Lastly, this truth is clearly set forth in the types. Christ was "a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13: 8. This fact appears to have been understood from the beginning, which probably may account for the skins with which God clothed our first parents. Be that as it may, Paul says, "Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." Why? Because, in his offering a firstling of his flock, the necessity of blood was acknowledged, and faith manifested in a coming Saviour whose shed blood was to atone for sin. From the beginning we find sacrifices and oblations were made, and for this Noah made provision by taking of clean beasts by sevens into the Ark. During the entire typical dispensation, for more than two thousand years, this truth was clearly set forth, and constantly held up by the church in the types. For it was the BLOOD that was annually taken within the holiest of all by the Jewish high priest to atone for sin.

Purposing brevity, I shall on this point simply give Paul's argument as written to the Hebrews, and rest the case. "But into the second (tabernacle) went the high priest alone once every year, (But mark!) ☞ NOT WITHOUT BLOOD, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people, * * which was a FIGURE for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and carnal ordinances imposed on them until the time of reformation. But CHRIST being come an HIGH PRIEST of GOOD THINGS TO COME, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by HIS OWN BLOOD he entered in ONCE into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall THE BLOOD OF CHRIST, who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. 9: 7, 9—14. And the apostle in pursuing the argument, shows that all things had to be purified with blood in the types, so also in the antitype the same necessity existed. But the point of difference was, that Christ had to make but one offering, once for all, instead of annually. Hence he says: "And almost all things are by the law purged with BLOOD; and without shedding of BLOOD is no remission. It was necessary therefore that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; (i. e. with the blood of bulls and goats), but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these, (i. e. with the blood of Christ). For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the FIGURES of the true; but into HEAVEN itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; * * * so Christ was ONCE OFFERED to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (or sin offering] unto salvation." Heb. 9: 22, 24, 28. Query, for those who believe men at death go into heaven in any form. Was the instance ever known of any person's entering the most holy place while the high priest was in officiating? If this should not satisfy, turn and read John 3: 13, where Christ says, "No man hath ascended up to HEAVEN, but he, [i. e. the son of man] that came down from heaven." So Peter also, on the day of pentecost, said: "David is not ascended into the heavens." Then if the types have any force, no man can go to heaven until Christ shall come forth to bless and save his people; and if Christ's words be true, no man had ever entered there before his coming to suffer.

In the above argument, Paul has clearly set forth the typical service of the Jewish church. In it we have clearly demonstrated, that the blood of Christ satisfied the demands of the law, and purchased eternal redemption for men. Now, inasmuch as we have heretofore shown that the demand of the law was the death of the SOUL, and that Christ "made his SOUL an offering for sin," which he "*poured out unto death*," and also that it was his BLOOD that was offered for, and redeemed us, without which there could be "no remission" for sin; it follows conclusively, beyond all contradiction, that "THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL OF ALL FLESH."

Other arguments might be given, but as we consider the point fully established by the word, and our object being simply to give the Bible view, I leave it for the brethren to judge how well we have succeeded. I have no controversy with those who cannot see as I do, I have only to ask that it may be tested by the word before rejected. Objections will naturally arise in the mind. I did not expect to present a view free from objections, even though I should be so fortunate as to present the Bible view perfectly. My Saviour could not, [or did not,] even to the intelligent Nicodemus, who cried out, "How can these things be?" Nor do I account myself able to remove satisfactory to all, at first, every objection that may be raised; but this I can say, I have held this view about five years, during which time I have presented it to hundreds [and among the number many intelligent ministers] and no valid objection, in my own mind, has ever been raised. It might be well to recollect, that objections against a theory do not disprove it. The plain declarations of the word must and will abide. One fact should not be forgotten connected with this view, that is, that God has repeatedly declared in his word that "THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL," in terms the most plain, literal, and positive that can possibly be given; but has no where said any other part of, or that the whole man is *the soul*. And why is it—in the absence of all proof, that any other part is the soul—God is not to be believed when he says that the *blood* is?

This truth has given me much light on the

Scriptures—removed the last fog and darkness from the great life and death doctrine—harmonized and made plain scores of passages previously obscure, and illuminated the whole plan of redemption as by a sunbeam of light from the throne, presenting it in new robes of beauty, simplicity and glory.

I leave the subject with you my brethren for consideration, praying that the spirit may guide us into all truth, and sanctify, and save us in the Kingdom of God, through Jesus Christ His Son. Amen. E. R. PINNEY.

Seneca Falls, N. Y. Oct. 14, 1853.

CAN THE SOUL BE KILLED?

"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear Him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell."—MATTHEW 10: 28.

These words are commonly supposed to teach that the essential nature of man resides in his soul, which is said to be a subsistence quite distinct from the body, which is only, we are told, a machine, constructed for the purpose of enabling the soul to live in, and hold intercourse with, this material world. They are further asserted to imply the indestructibility and deathlessness of the soul, which, it is affirmed, is altogether beyond the reach of any mortal injury, and that the utmost man can do is to destroy the material machine, or body, and effect its separation from the soul, which soars away to some new place, and in a new condition of existence.

Now I ask the candid and intelligent reader on what authority does he suppose that the soul is a distinct subsistence—a complete organization in itself—and constituting the human personality, apart from the body? Is this extensively prevalent notion derived from the Bible? Will the reader pause to recal any portion of the Sacred Scriptures where the soul is so described as containing *in itself* the essential properties of the human being, and capable of a separate state of existence? These, the popular ideas about the soul, are the doctrines which were first taught by the heathen philosophers Pythagoras and Plato, and which have been perpetuated to the present time, through the influence of the most eminent of the so-called Christian Fathers, who, before their conversion to Christianity, were professors of the Platonic philosophy, The modern opinions about the soul are, therefore, purely *heathen*, and not scriptural. They have laid the foundations of the most corrupt and mischievous doctrines, both among Protestants and Papists. The Protestant has been led by his heathen notions of the human soul to believe in a state of life *in* death and before the resurrection, and that the wicked shall endure *eternal torments* in hell. The Papist has, yet more corruptly, been led to believe, besides what the Protestant believes, in Purgatory, Indulgences, the worship of the Virgin Mary, and deceased Apostles and Saints. Such are some of the many evils which Plato's doctrine of the Immortality and Separate State of the Soul has introduced into the Christian Church.

If, then, we are not to hold the popular opinions about the human soul, what does our text mean? In reply to this question, I request the reader to examine the parallel passage as recorded in Luke's Gospel, chap. 12, v. 4, 5: "I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have *no more* that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear Him who, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell." In this version of our Lord's words, the word 'soul' does not occur; and instead of '*are not able to kill the soul*,' we have the words '*have no more that they can do.*' The meaning then is clearly the following: Although wicked men are able to kill the Lord's people, they can do no more than this—they have no power to keep them dead,—they cannot destroy the soul or life which the Lord has promised to give his people, by raising them from the dead to die no more.

The word 'soul' is to be understood in this passage as the same in meaning with the word *life:* in proof of which I ask the reader's consideration of the following pasages which occur in Matthew, chap. 16, v. 25, 26: "Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it: For what is a man profited if he gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul?*" Now the word translated '*life*' twice in the 25th verse, and '*soul*' twice in the 26th verse, is *one and the same Greek word in all four places.* Why should one word receive different translations in two such closely connected and current texts? The answer is plain. The translators of the Bible held the popular heathen notions about the human soul, and therefore to have used the word *soul* in the 25th verse would have grated upon their ears. "Whosoever will save his *soul* shall *lose it* [!], and whosoever will *lose his soul* [!], for my sake shall find it." Hence they employed the word '*life*' in this verse, and the word '*soul*' in the verse following! But there is evidently no good reason why one Greek word, occurring as it does in this passage, four times consecutively, should be translated by two different English words. If the reader will substitute the word '*life*' in the 26th verse for the word '*soul*,' as is done in the previous verse, he will find a natural, and as I believe, the strictly correct meaning of our Lord's words, "Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it, and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake shall find it: For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *life*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *life?*" What our Lord says here is very plain; "Whosoever will save his life [in this world at the expense of his duty to me] shall lose it [in the world to come]. And whosoever will lose his life [in this world] for my sake shall find it [in the world to come]. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the

whole [present] world and lose his own life [in the world to come]; or what shall a man give in exchange for his [future and everlasting] life?" To *lose the soul* then, does not mean that the soul as a separate being, without a body, goes away to be everlastingly tormented; but means to *lose the blessed privilege of endless life.* When the *soul is lost*, the *man himself*, in his entire and complete nature, is lost, or cast away from conscious and endless existence, as Luke, in the parallel passage to that we are now considering, most clearly represents. "For what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and *lose himself*, or be *cast away?*" Chap. 9: v. 25.

The text at the head of this tract is but partially and imperfectly understood by those who quote it with so much assurance in proof that the soul, as a separate being, cannot, and will not, be ever destroyed. What our Lord says is, that *man* is not able to kill the soul, or destroy the life which He will give his people; but He Himself *is able* to kill the soul, and cut off the wicked from having endless life. "Fear Him who *is able* to DESTROY BOTH SOUL and BODY IN HELL." And as our Lord warns mankind to fear Him as having the power to DESTROY THE WHOLE MAN in the ALL-CONSUMING fires of Hell, he evidently implies that *such is the punishment* which he will visit upon the wicked. The miserable subjects of the future punishment will not be perpetuated in conscious sin and suffering, but shall be 'burnt up' as 'chaff' or 'stubble' in the 'lake of fire' which shall flow around the burning world. "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and PERDITION OF UNGODLY MEN." 2 Peter, chap. 3, v. 7.—*Rev. J. Panton Ham.*

INQUIRY.—I would like to hear your opinion on John 10:18. How had Christ *power* when he was dead to raise himself? and if this was not the power, what was it? F. B.

The original word here translated *power* is *exousian.* It has the sense not only of power, but of *authority, right, liberty, privilege, &c.* Thus John 1: 12, "But to as many as received him, to them gave he *power* [the right, or *privilege*] to become the sons of God," &c. Again, Heb. 13: 10, "We have an altar, whereof they have no *right—exousian*—to eat," &c. Christ received power, right, authority, *privilege*, to lay down his life and to take it again, from his Father; and the uniform testimony of all the apostles is, that "*God* raised up *Christ* from the dead." Christ voluntarily laid down his life: God had promised to *raise him up*, and to do it *early*, before corruption should set in. In view of that promise Christ, when expiring, *committed his life* to his Father, and his Father restored him to life the third day. There is nothing in the Bible to warrant the idea that Christ raised *himself* from the dead. Such a view is a virtual *denial of h. death.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1854.

OUR TERMS.—*One dollar* pays for the Examiner for *this year only.* Such payment will give no claim *beyond* December next. We wish this distinctly understood. The subscriber may receive the back numbers from January first, or not, as he pleases; but *no abatement* can be made in the subscription price if he does not. Payment *in advance* is our *invariable* rule. *No agent* is authorized to receive subscriptions upon any other terms. The money may be sent by mail at *our risk, post paid*, if carefully enclosed, and directed "GEORGE STORRS, *New York.*" Any Preacher, if truly poor—and most are—shall have the paper without charge, provided he will do the best he can to procure subscribers for us, and remit the money. But to receive the paper a whole year, and then tell us they could not obtain a subscriber, is to say they have no influence, or have felt no interest in the Examiner.

BOUND EXAMINERS.—We have the Bible Examiner for 1850 and '51 bound in one volume; also 1852 and '53 in one. Price $1.50 each. Those who may wish them sent by mail can have it done, but the postage will be 30 cents per volume if pre-paid, or 45 if paid on delivery.

We can furnish the Examiner in *sheets* for '49, '50, '51, '52, and '53. Price for either of those years 50 cents; or, the five years together for $2. We have only a few of '49 left, and none of '48. These works will be found to contain much and various matter, on the Immortality question, having gathered in them from all quarters on this theme.

ENCOURAGING.—It seems our voice, in the last Examiner, has awakened the "*True Wesleyan.*" We are right glad to see its face once more, now edited by "LUCIUS C. MATLACK," at *Syracuse, N. Y.*" We thank Br. M. for his notice that the Bible Examiner is now published *twice* each month, instead of *monthly*, as formerly. The Wesleyan may be assured we meant nothing *un-* "*complimentary*" in our remarks on its "*exit*

from this city," or its long silence as an "*exchange.*" But we did wish it to act *brotherly*, and not refuse to let us see its face, because we believe the wicked will be "annihilated." Surely, Br. Wesleyan, is there anything more wicked than a lack of *love?* Paul saith—"Though I speak with the tongues of men and angels and have *not love*, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and have not *love*, I am nothing."

Now, neither the Wesleyan or Examiner are entitled to the "character" of the *righteous* if the apostolic characteristic—*love*—is lacking.—And it certainly looks like being wanting if we refuse an *exchange* because we differ in opinion. But we have learned to forgive on the first appearance of repentance. Repentance is not a profession, but a *real turning about.* The evidence of it in the Wesleyan is manifest in its visits to us once more. May its light continue to shine.

Zion's Herald, also, now visits us regularly: in which fact we rejoice. We are glad to see the faces of these old friends. Each of the other papers, named in our last, still keep dark. Perhaps they think their light will do us no good. Possibly it may be so; yet they would manifest a *brotherly* heart by a different course. They may think we are unworthy of a brotherly manifestation, because we differ from them in opinion as to the true source of immortality, and the end of the wicked; but one thing is perfectly clear to our mind, that they must meet the question of man's natural immortality, and of endless sin and suffering as they have never met it yet. When such men as PROF. MAURICE, of King's College, England, and PRES. BEECHER, of this country, are themselves so aroused, and arousing others, to think of the terrible reproach cast on the character of God, our Maker, by the horrible doctrine of endless sin and suffering, it is not likely that any of the sectarian "organs" can keep quite still, or deal in such barren arguments as have heretofore been used to sustain such a theory.

A prominent Presbyterian Minister, from Ohio, called on us a few days since to procure "*Bible vs. Tradition.*" and said he wished to understand our sentiments, that if we were in error he could the better guard the people against it; at the same time declared, it would be a "great *emancipation*" if he could be satisfied we were correct. He also informed us, that a Hebrew and Greek scholar, in the west, had embraced our views and written an Essay in defence, which is soon to be published. This person, our informant says, had spent several days with him and read him his essay; since which time the writer of the essay had been "*decapitated*" by the powers in church. He is, however, undismayed.

"*The Conflict of Ages,*" by Pres. Beecher, shows that a revolution is going on, and the doctrine of endless sin and suffering is destined to fall. Universalism and Restorationism both being, to our mind, clearly unscriptural, the only refuge of any, if they adhere to the Bible, is that "Immortality and Endless Life are only through Jesus Christ, and by a Resurrection from the Dead at the last day:" and the resurrection to immortality is only to those who are *now* "*made partakers of the divine nature;*" or have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God, which is both the divine life in man and the living power by which the incorruptible resurrection is effected.

"EXIST AS LONG AS GOD ENDURES."—What shall? "*Man!*" Who saith so? "Professor Harkey, D. D., of the Illinois State University," at Springfield, in his address "Before the Young Men's Christian Association," at that place. We quote the following from that address.

"What is it to be great? Dr. Harkey said that he would not talk of battles, of conquests, or of noble blood. Greatness consists in a true appreciation of ourselves,—a true estimate of and a proper regard for our own intellectual natures. Man was endowed with an immortal spirit, which shall exist as long as God endures. He is not, therefore, a bubble cast up by the ocean of eternity to float a while upon the surface of and then disappear forever. * * * No; he will forever live, blooming in the Paradise of God; or eternally withering, not dying, in the regions of despair."

Thus speaks a D. D.; but thus speaketh not the voice of God, nor His prophets, Jesus Christ nor his apostles: and "Dr. Harkey" had better *hearken* to these teachers of God's will, and learn, "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*"—"The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall *consume*, into smoke shall they consume away;" not be "eternally withering, not dying, in the regions of despair." No,

Dr. Harkey; the Psalmist, the prophet Ezekiel, as well as Paul, and the whole Bible stamps your *assumption* of man's immortality as a fable and a falsehood. Not one solitary text is there in that entire volume that affirms man is immortal, or that he has either an immortal spirit or soul. If Dr. Harkey can produce one such text in the Bible, except Gen. 3: 4. "Ye shall not surely die"—we will travel all the way to Illinois on our knees to ask his pardon for this notice of him; and will pledge ourself to procure a Cardinal's hat from Rome, immediately. A greater service he could not do the Pope.

"PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE."—As some take the Examiner who did not last year, we would say, that this Committee associated together, last March, with the *one only object* to spread light on the *Life Theme*; and to this end, to offer *help*, so far as in our power, to those preachers who might be found able and willing to give their time to this work; leaving them at perfect liberty to preach on all other points of Bible truth according to their own convictions of truth and duty. If we are to be believed, we have never proposed to *restrict* such preachers from preaching the "*whole truth*" on any subject which they considered the Bible taught.—The insinuations, therefore, in the Advent Harbinger, to the contrary, so often uttered, we regard not in the light of *friendship*, to say nothing more. We shall not, however, stop to explain nor complain, but keep about *our own work*.—Not one of the *Prov. Com.* charge or receive one cent for their services; and all of them have contributed something to the funds. A faithful report of receipts and expenditures show from what places we receive funds and how they are appropriated; tho' the names of the individual donors are not made public. Nearly all the *labor* of the Committee falls on the Editor of the Examiner, who is the Treasurer, and keeps up the correspondence with the preachers assisted. If any wish to aid *him, personally*, it should not be directed "*for the Prov. Com.*," as he will not appropriate any such funds to himself.

Shall the work in which we are engaged go on? If it does, funds will be necessary. Near $400 have been paid in, since we first commenced; and something over that sum has been paid out by the Treasury. Some $200 more have been subscribed to the funds, through the labors of Br. Blain; which, we doubt not, will be paid soon. We wish to aid several other preachers, who are ready to work, whose names have not yet appeared in the Examiner. All communications should be addressed, "*George Storrs, New York.*"

HENRY A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEO. STORRS. } *Prov. Com.*

NEW YORK, January, 1854.

RECEIPTS since last Report, Jan. 1st.
From a friend in New Bedford, Mass., $3. A friend at Bergen Point, $10. A friend in New York city, $5. Through Br. Garbutt, from friends in Somerset, N. Y., $8; and Orangeport, N. Y., $2. Through Br. C. F. Sweet, various collections, $16.25. By Br. Jacob Blain, from friends in Buffalo, N. Y., $7; South Butler, $2,50; Clyde, $2; Victor, $5; a friend in New York city, $20. Total—$80,75.

DISBURSEMENTS during same time:
To C. F. Sweet, $16.25. To T. Garbutt, $10. To J. Blain, 36,50. Total—$62,75.

Treasury overdrawn at last report, $30, 65. Still overdrawn, $12,65.

FROM THOMAS GARBUTT.

Orangeport, N. Y., Jan. 2, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—December—the second month of my labor under the patronage of the Provisionary Committee, is past; and the year '53 is gone. I feel thankful to God for past favors. My health has been good. I have enjoyed some very sweet seasons in meeting with His saints; meetings long to be remembered, I think, by all who have attended. I have nothing of a discouraging character to send you, though I have had some long and cold rides and walks; sometimes a dark cloud has past over me, but I feel encouraged. It appears to me that I have accomplished more in the two months past than in any previous two months of my life for the advancement of the cause of truth. I have dared to launch out in a wider field; new places are opening, &c. I have visited another Christian church, since I wrote to you last, in Lyndon, Orleans Co. I expect to meet with them for a time every Sunday morning, and in Somerset every Sunday evening. The interest in Somerset is increasing. Last evening every seat was occupied. Eld. Hathaway was with me in the morning; it was truly good to be there. The brethren in these places love God and the truth. I design to spend my week-day evenings around in various places, regularly, every two weeks, and see what can be accomplished in that way.

GEO. T. ADAMS, 167 Hanover-st., Boston, Mass., keeps constantly on hand the "*Bible vs. Tradition;*" and it can be had of him, and at the same price as at our office: viz., 75 cents single, or ten copies for $5.

PERSONAL IDENTITY.

BY ELD. J. S. WHITE.

"*It is I myself.*"—Luke 24: 39.

Our Saviour, after his resurrection, gave abundant proof of his identity and personality. "He shewed himself alive by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Acts 1: 1–6. He was not only seen of the apostles, at different times, but he was seen at one time of "above five hundred brethren." See 1 Cor. 15: 1–8. On the day of his resurrection he appeared to two of his disciples on the way to Emmaus, and after a long conversation he made himself known to them in breaking of bread.—They immediately repaired to Jerusalem, and finding the eleven gathered together with others, related what they had seen. "And as they thus spake Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." They did not suppose that they saw a man, but a spirit, or something that looked like a man, an apparition, or ghost. The Saviour, to convince them of their mistake, showed them the difference between a *man* and a spectre. In doing this he proved to them that it was he himself. What did he say to convince them of his personality and identity? He said, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself, handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." In this he referred to their knowledge of him before his crucifixion. Christ was now immortal, for death was to have no more dominion over him. He gave them the same evidence of his identity in the one state as in the other, namely, that he had *flesh* and *bones*. He appealed to their senses, sight and touch. They could *see* his hands and feet, and they could *handle* them and ascertain that it was he himself.

Why should not this be the evidence of his personality? That it was, from the cradle to the cross, is admitted by all. He was taken from the cross and laid in the sepulchre, hands and feet, flesh and bones. On the third day he arose, left the tomb, and appeared to the disciples; was with them at different times for forty days. He was received up into heaven, the declaration following.—"This *same Jesus* shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." When he returns then, he will have flesh and bones, else it will not be that same Jesus—the I myself. If our Saviour does not possess these marks of personality, we have no evidence of his existence. To believe in a Saviour who has no hands and feet composed of flesh and bones, is to believe in no Saviour.—For such a Saviour would not be the one who said, "It is I myself."

The evidence Christ gave of his own being, is true in its application to man. Man without a body does not exist. The Bible everywhere speaks of him as existing in this form, whether dead or alive. When God made the body he made the man. The body was the man. God breathed into the man the breath of life. The breath was not the man, but that which made the man live. Man sinned and died, and went to dust. The compact form which God made, has been distributed into dust, not annihilated. The body is there in the form of dust. And there is man, else he is nowhere, and the word of the Lord has failed; for the Lord said to the *man*, "Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return." "*Man* lieth *down* and riseth not till the heavens be no more."

Said Jacob to Joseph—"*Bury me with my fathers in the cave*, that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite. There they buried Abraham and Sarah, his wife; and there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there they buried Leah." They did not bury their *remains*, and let their persons escape to go somewhere else. If what was buried in that field had gone to nothing, then has Abraham gone to nothing, for he was buried there. Their persons went down to the grave with flesh and bones, and they will come up with flesh and bones, else they will not be the ones who died. "Thy dead men shall live. Awake and sing; ye that dwell in the dust. Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness. I will raise him up at the last day. The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and come forth. Stephen fell on sleep. They that sleep in Jesus shall rise first."

In these passages, and others of the same import, it is the *man* that sleeps, dies, is dead, in the grave, in dust. And it is the *same* man that is to be raised from the dead. As man, this side of death, does not exist without bodily organs, so neither does he exist the other side of death without these organs. Or if he does we have no evidence that he he is the man who lived here. Man without substance.—flesh and bones, that can be seen and handled, we know nothing about. If there are such men, they are outside of the Bible. The Bible contemplates man as a literal, material being. As such he was made; as such he lives and dies; and as such he will live in the future state or not live at all.

FROM DR. JOHN HOWELL.

Lewiston, Me., Dec. 26, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—I am happy to see where I travel an increasing interest in the subject of Life and Immortality through Christ alone.—The more I reflect and preach upon the subject, the more satisfied am I that a correct understanding of it is necessary in order to the reception of other truths, the importance of which is but faintly perceived without it. The resurrection of the dead, literally from the grave, is the hope of the church, and the literal resurrection of Christ is not only the foundation of that hope, but also of the Christian system.

Now what fact in the whole system of revealed truth so beautifully developes the importance of that event, as that the dead sleep in their graves, whither they go, Ecc. 9: 10, till it occurs? They "know not anything," is a truth presented on almost every page of the Bible, and yet what an effort is made by theologians of every name to prove they do. Not content with the declarations of Jehovah, they seem to feel themselves necessitated to make the above expression and others like it void. And indeed the support of their theological systems is the only thing that can create such a necessity.—God abideth faithful—his word will endure for ever—and by Solomon he has said, in Eccl. 3: 19, 20, that man and beast have "*one breath*, and *all go unto one place*,"—the reason of which is, that "*all* are *of* the dust, and *all* turn to dust again." In direct opposition to this, says Scholastic theology, in death one man goes directly to hell, another to heaven, and the beast to the earth, which makes three places. Preposterous! When will men be willing that God should speak what he means, and mean what he speaks? Again, said David, Ps. 92: 7, "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when *all* the workers of iniquity do flourish: it is that they shall be *destroyed for ever*." In all this the love of God is clearly manifested. Rather than exert his power to perpetuate the sinner's life in the fires of an orthodox hell for ever, causing "his fiery indignation to kindle, and his incensed fury to feed the flame of their torment," as said Mr. Benson in his sermon on "The Future Misery of the Wicked," he causes them to "be as though they had not been." Obad. 16 v. How much more lovely does the character of God appear, when he is considered as inflicting a penalty upon the sinner, according to the literal import of the terms used to define it, as "the *soul* that sinneth it shall die," than by torturing our intellects, and bringing into requisition all the powers of imagination to originate terms as the definitions of '*die*,' sufficiently strong to answer a miserable lifeless theology, and produce in the mind of the sinner such a picture of horror, as to exclude the possibility of loving the author of such a scheme. If such be gospel, mercy grant that we may have another edition, more favorable to the character of its author.—Thanks be to God that the gospel of his grace declares the sinner shall die, and that eternal life is obtained only through Christ.

Bro. S. S. Brewer and myself are delivering a course of lectures on this subject in this place (Lewiston). The interest up to last evening increases at every lecture, and we hope to see a good result. Br. Brewer has been lecturing ten miles below here, in Durham, on this and kindred subjects, at which place a deep interest was manifested by almost the entire community, and especially those belonging to the Universalist Society. Commenced by invitation in the Baptist meeting house; it being refused after the first lecture, the Universalists kindly opened theirs, when their entire congregation, with the exception of about twenty, repaired to listen to the truth. The result of which was, that a number of them embraced the doctrine of immortality through Christ alone, and his speedy coming, among whom was one of the main pillars of the society. We think of returning there, and presenting something further on the subject. The Lord bless you in presenting the truth, is the prayer of your brother in the faith.

From Daniel Morris.

Rushville, N. Y.

Geo. Storrs:—Dear Sir.—I have been a regular reader of the Bible Examiner since you were at this place, in 1851, and am constrained to admit the truthfulness of its matter.

Some months prior to your coming to our place I had embraced Christianity, and entered, as I hoped, upon the performance of religious duties. I had ever yielded a nominal assent to the popular theory of the day, not doubting the truth of what the orthodox clergy taught. I was urged for my own safety to unite with the church, and had concluded to do so. Still I thought I would examine the foundation of my faith; as also the truth of the church creed as tested by Revelation. Strange to say, as I examined, I grew, for the first time in my life, skeptical. It alarmed me—I attributed it to the evil one. I prayed God to enlighten my dark understanding. Yet the more I examined the evidence, the further was I from the orthodox creed. I compared opinions with a friend who had embraced Christianity at the same time I did. He was embarrassed in the same way;—for he, as myself, had concluded to adopt the enquiry—What saith the Scripture? rather than what saith the creed?

We were thus examining, doubting, and again struggling to accommodate and reconcile theology and the Scripture, when you came to our place. I heard your first sermon. For the first time I heard it,—you raised the question—"*Is man immortal?*" My doubts vanished—the mystery was solved, the Scriptures were no longer a revealed book. I had started wrong—I had affirmed what was untrue, and was trying to accommodate the Scripture to my erroneous assumption. I now have no difficulty in understanding the *Word*.

From Benjamin Coddington.

Lafayette, Ind.

Br Storrs:—I rejoice to say to you that the truth of God is beginning to find way into the minds of quite a number in this place. Some young men of character and intelligence have come out and embraced the truth of the Bible. This has caused some of our orthodox ministers to come down on the doctrines, and denounce those who advocate them as a class of refined infidels, who (as a Methodist minister said, last Sabbath evening) are trying to pervert the truth

of the Bible in order to have a covering for their sins.

If we are to be called by hard names, and persecuted for truth's sake, ought we not in meekness rather to rejoice?

Bro Richmond was with us last summer, and also this winter, and spent two Sabbaths at each visit. I am happy to say, that his labors have not been in vain in the Lord. There is a manifest disposition among the people to look into these things. May the Lord guide their minds into all truth.

I must say in conclusion that I have been thankful to God, many times, that your Six Sermons ever fell into my hands. I consider them the great key that unlocks the mind to a proper understanding of the Scriptures, and exposes the superstitions and traditions of men.—When I look upon the great and solemn truths of the Holy Bible, I marvel that there is so little practical piety among the people. When I look out upon the mass of my ~~fellow~~ countrymen and see how little effort is made to seek for that glory which is of God, and that honor and immortality which none but God can give, I ask, Who shall be able to stand at his coming and kingdom? My prayer is that the spirit of God may lead me into His will in all things.

From Orange Hitchcock.

China, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—The error that it is the purpose of God to hold his creatures in eternal torments, for sins unrepented of, which they commit in this world, lays the foundation of other errors, and makes the whole plan of redemption dark, intricate, and bewildering to those who upon this principle try to understand it. Is the idea a rational one that an infinitely holy and wise being would ever form a plan whereby he could save those who have broken his laws, and his principles of justice remain untarnished, without making it plain, clear, and comprehensible to all his accountable creatures? I think not. And this is a strong argument against the so-called orthodox theory.

Is it too much to say that not one individual who has embraced the doctrine, that there is no immortality for any one only through Christ, but what will admit that they see a simplicity, a consistency, and glory in the gospel which they never saw while believers in the common theory? There may be one, but it does not seem possible to me.

For one, I feel to praise God for the light which was first thrown upon my mind by your Six Sermons, which was the means of leading me from the mazes of darkness and error into the light and clear channel of truth.

I read and reflected, studied and examined the Word of God to see if that which seemed to be light was really so, until about six months had past away, when I expressed my belief openly that the common theory of the endless torment of the finally impenitent was not taught in the Word of God, and was contrary to reason.—Whether I have the truth upon this subject or not, I think I never can see differently until I can be made to believe that light is darkness and darkness is light.

One thing which my experience has helped me to learn is this, when I meet with those who cannot be persuaded to read anything upon the subject—which I frequently do—not to suffer any feeling of condemnation to arise in my breast, when sympathy, love, and a strong desire they might see and embrace the truth, should be permitted to dwell there unmolested.

From John Lindsey.

Milo, Me.

Br. Storrs:—I will give you some parts of my experience since March last, when I was in Boston, and heard the course of lectures that you delivered in that city, at that time. I also subscribed for the Examiner, and procured some other works on the theory of life and death, which, to me, before that, was unknown; but those works, together with your arguments at your lectures, and a careful reading of the Bible, have set my mind at ease in regard to man's destiny after death. I believe that man has no immortality except through Christ. He only will give eternal life, and that at the resurrection. I have had some trials to contend with. I have been set aside from the church to which I belonged, called infidel; and when they were not able to answer my questions, they have used ridicule. But all this does not make me doubt in the least; for I believe that the popular doctrine of an endless existence in conscious torment will not long find support in enquiring minds. I know not as there is one person within the circle of fifty miles of me that I can confer with on this theory. I feel alone, at times, in this respect; but I try to have my trust in God, not caring who is against me if my ways are accepted by him.

From James Battersby.

Springfield, Ill., Nov. 28, 1853.

Br. Storrs:—In a few weeks I shall remove to Fort Smith, Ark.; a growing town on the junction of the State of Arkansas, the Cherokee, Choctaw, and Creek Nations. I wish you would call attention to my spending the winter and spring there; and if there be any in that region of country desiring my services, you can say, I am their servant for Christ's sake.

We hope Br. Battersby will find a good opening to preach the *Word of Life* in Arkansas.—There labor is needed, we are sure: and we trust our brother will show himself a workman in that field.—Editor.

THE CROSS.—A REVIEW.

Philadelphia, Dec. 2, 1853.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—As you nobly remark, "The freedom of thought and expression of thought, we will maintain for ourselves and *concede to others*," I send for publication in your valuable periodical, a few strictures on Mr. Ham's articles "on the Doctrine of the Cross."

Yours, in Ch. love,
HENRY GREW.

In Mr. Ham's very interesting articles on "The Doctrine of the Cross," there are a few remarks which I beg leave to review "in love."

Not only do I most cordially unite with our talented friend in rejecting the "theory which professes to explain the Christ of the Scriptures by placing him on the category of mere humanity only;" but as cordially do I respond to all his representations of Him who is "the image of the invisible God," with a single exception.—He remarks—"And if we were to analyze this deeper feeling, shall we not find it to be akin to that hallowed feeling with which we venerate the Supreme God himself?" To this no objection can be justly made, for the word of divine inspiration teaches us that, as the Father has committed all judgment to the Son, he is to be honored, *in some sense*, even as we honor the Father. John 5: 22, 23.

But the writer adds,—"Nay, more: can our analysis show that the feeling is not really identical?". I reply, it is, as the writer himself says, "*akin*," but not "*identical*." The latter involves the important error, of giving that glory of absolute supremacy and independency to another, which the Father exclusively possesses, and which he declares he "will not give to another."

"The Greek, in John's Gospel, translated '*with* God,' is '*pros ton Theon.*' The idea of the preposition *pros* is that of *nearness*, bordering upon, yet not absolute *identity; likeness* without *sameness*." The representation of Philo Judæus, who was contemporary with our Lord, quoted also by the writer from Dr. Pye Smith, that the Son is "*fixed the nearest, there being no intervening existence*, to the Only One, who is self-existent," is also incompatible with identity. The Father is *self-existent* and *independent*. The Son, though in respect to all created beings, he has the pre-eminence, is "*begotten*" and *dependent*. His own testimony is, "I live by the Father." Our feelings of adoration, &c., should be in accordance with Truth. The Father is to be worshipped with feelings of adoration, &c., in harmony with the great truth that he is, as Jesus Christ, "the faithful Witness," declares, "the only true God." John 17: 3. The Son is to be worshipped with feelings corresponding with the truth that he is the "first begotten of the Father;" the very "image of the invisible God," and the only Name by whom we must be saved from everlasting death. These feelings, truly analyzed, cannot be "really identical."

The intelligent writer remarks—

"In the view of the parable of the wicked husbandman, which sets forth the morality of our Lord's treatment, and the estimation in which God, as the Lord of the vineyard, regarded his Son's rejection, it will not be doubted that the crucifixion of Christ, so far from being acceptable to God, or demanded by any principle of his perfect moral government, was altogether a guilty violation of his holy will, and a daring defiance of his law authority."

Now, I ask not whether or not this representation of the death of the Son of God, will stand the test of any "scheme of popular Christianity." I ask, will it or will it not stand the test of the Word which abideth forever? Let us see.

That the rejection and crucifixion of the Son of the Blessed, was, *in respect to the Jews*, "a guilty violation of (God's) holy will," *revealed as the standard of their duty*, is no question of controversy. They did so "with *wicked* hands." This truth, however, must be received in a sense which will not invalidate other divine testimonies relative to the same subject, which are equally plain and positive.

Whether or not the act was or was not, *in any respect*, "acceptable to God," the following declarations of the Eternal Spirit will determine.

"*It pleased* the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief, when thou shalt make his soul (life) an offering for sin, he shall see his seed," &c. "That he *by the grace of God* should taste death for every man." "Awake, O Lord, against my Shepherd, against the man, my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts:" "Jesus Christ, *whom God hath set forth* to be a propitiation for sin, through faith in his blood," &c. "Him being delivered *by the determinate counsel* and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." "For of a truth, against thy only child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatever thy hand and thy counsel *determined* before to be done." When Peter objected to the crucifixion of our blessed Lord, Jesus said, "Thou savorest not the things *which be of God*," &c.

Whether or not the inspired writers "allude to the crucifixion of Christ as being designed to satisfy any judicial demands of the law of God; or to secure the moral efficiency of the divine government," the following passages will determine.

"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation (mercy seat) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness; *that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*" "He hath made him to be sin (i. e., a sin offering) for us—that we may be made the righteousness of God in

him." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed is every one who hangeth on a tree." "Christ *died for our sins* according to the Scriptures."—"Washed us *from our sins in his own blood.*" "In whom we have redemption *through his blood.*" "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that *by means of death for the redemption of the transgression*, that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." "Once in the end of the world (age or state) hath he appeared *to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.*"—"For if, when we were enemies, *we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*," &c.—"This man, after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins*," &c. "He was wounded *for our transgression*, he was bruised *for our iniquities*," &c. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all," &c. "He shall bear their iniquities."—"Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "Gave himself for our sins." Other similar passages might be adduced.

If it was no part of the divine wisdom to make the life of him, our blessed Saviour, "an offering for sin"—if it did *not* please "the Lord to bruise him," where, I ask, is to be found the import of the former sacrifices, "That could not make him that did the service perfect," being only "imposed on them until the time of reformation?" Where shall we find the true solution of that important declaration, "Without the shedding of blood, there is no remission," if it is not found in the announcement of the harbinger of the Son of the Blessed, "Behold the LAMB of God, *which taketh away the sin of the world?*"

Whether or not these divine testimonies can possibly be reconciled with the unqualified denial that the death of the Son of God was "demanded by any principle of his (God's) perfect moral government," is submitted to the intelligent reader. I ask what language could the inspired writer have employed to teach such a sentiment, which would be plainer or more appropriate, than the declaration that the design of the God of Salvation, in this transcendant transaction was, "*that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus?*"—Rom. 3: 26.

If the above, and other kindred passages, do not teach some important connection between the death of the Son of God, and the righteousness of the divine government in the forgiveness of sin—if they do not teach that our Lord's obedience unto the death of the Cross, was, in some important sense, *vicarious*, I despair of learning any thing from the sacred volume.

None of these passages declare that the innocent Saviour was *punished;* neither do they necessarily imply, that he has so paid our debt to the Father, as to exclude the plain and important scriptural doctrine of the Father's mercy and forgiveness.

[*To be Continued.*]

INQUIRY.—"Permit me to ask an exposition of Isaiah 57: 1, 2. It seems to carry the idea of walking and resting at the same time. I get along with it by making it a double assurance that they shall rest in their bed (or graves) and also enter into peace; but I don't know *when* the walking in their uprightness *is declared* to be. But I do believe I am authorized to make an inference in harmony with the positive declarations that "The dead know not anything," "The dead praise not the Lord," &c. It is one of those passages at which the immortal-soulists catch, as a drowning man does at a straw."

A. A. B.

ANS.—All obscurity is at once removed from this text by the Septuagint, which reads the two verses as follows:—

"See how the just man has perished, and no man lays it to heart; and righteous men are taken away, and no one considers: for the righteous has been removed out of the way of injustice. His burial shall be in peace; he has been removed out of the way."

Judgments were to fall on the wicked *idolators* next spoken of, but the upright who rested in the grave, were "out of the way," having been "buried in peace." The text affords not even the support of a "*straw*" to the "immortal-soulists." Truly they "feed on wind" when they try to press this text into their service.

A NEW TRACT.

I propose publishing a tract in which will be given a clear, and irrefutable Bible answer to the question

WHAT IS THE SOUL?

1st. By the plain declarations of the word.

2d. By the plan of redemption as revealed in the gospel.

3d. By the plan of redemption as set forth in the types.

PART II.

Eight objections to the doctrine considered.

PART III.

Application to the doctrines of the Bible as held by the church.

The pamphlet will be 18 mo, 48 or 64 pages, with paper covers. Price not to exceed $4 per hundred; and, if it can be afforded at, $3; for considering the truth presented important, I desire for it as a primary object a wide circulation. As a secondary, a small advance to aid in the support of myself and family. It will be published as soon as returns can be obtained of the number wanted. Address me at Seneca Falls, Seneca Co., N. Y.

E. R. PINNEY.

Jan. 7, 1854.

To Our Patrons.—The remainder of our Discourse on "*Obedience to God*" is deferred till February to make room for Br. Grew and others. The articles in this number will give ample matter for two weeks' consideration. Let them be pondered well, and not passed over slightly. We issue the Examiner *to be read.* If you do not read it carefully, you may as well not have it. These are days in which minds are stirred, and we shall all be carried some where: there is no avoiding it. Let us then examine well and thoroughly the way we travel, and see that we are on the *right track.* Old stereotyped theological dogmas, forced on our minds in childhood, have now to pass a fiery trial. If they are "*gold*" they will stand the test; if "*wood and stubble*" they will be burned up. He that is afraid, or shrinks from having his theological views tried, gives sad evidence that he loves *ease* more than *truth.* One thing we are perfectly assured of, that the old "*theological hell,*" of *endless sin and suffering*, is destined to go to the "moles and to the bats." But what is coming in its place? To those who still maintain that man has an immortal soul, *final restoration* is the inevitable *substitute.* We have *facts* on that point among the ministers, even in this city, that assure us we are not mistaken in the tendency of "orthodox" preachers to *restorationism.* They cannot longer make themselves nor others believe that there is any possible way to reconcile endless sin and suffering with the attributes of God; but holding still to the immortality of a soul in man—they are falling into the wake of the German divines, and that of Bishop Newton, who in his "*Dissertation,*" "*On the final state and condition of men,*" after a labored effort to show that "*everlasting*" means only as long as their wicked character should continue, says:

"Repentance, therefore, is not impossible in hell; but yet you may ask—What reason is there to think it possible? and I answer—Because *it is impossible for any creature to live in eternal torments.* Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings? * * * Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. * * * 'God is love,' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. * * * Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing * * * delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine if you may, but you can never seriously believe it,* nor reconcile it to God and goodness. * * God * * could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. * * The *letter* of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments, but the *spirit* of Scripture intimates the contrary."

Satisfy these men that there is no immortality in man; and that it can only be realized as a *gift* of God, through Jesus Christ, and by the resurrection at the last day, and they will discover that the clear and full testimony of the Scriptures to the *utter destruction* of the wicked needs no theological twattle to do away its plain utterance on the question—"All the wicked will God destroy." "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away." Psalm 37, 20; and 145, 20. Also Psalm 101, 8, "I will early *annihilate* all the wicked of the land; that I may *annihilate* all wicked doers from the city of the Lord." In this last text we have given the literal translation of the original word according to Professor Pick, in his "Bible Student's Concordance." No truth is more clearly stated, in the Bible, than the total, entire, and "everlasting destruction" of the enemies of God: and nothing hinders any man from seeing it so except the *tradition* of an immortal soul in man. We say "*tradition,*" because there is not one solitary text from Genesis to Revelation that affirms any such doctrine. Let those find it who suppose it is there, if they can.

Let the "*Bible vs. Tradition*" continue to be scattered; under God it will uproot the last remnant of that pernicious fable. Price 75 cents, or ten copies for $5.

The Life Theme in New York.—A meeting has been opened in this city, where this *theme* is to be made *prominent,* at *Mechanics' Hall,* 472 Broadway, above Grand Street. None of the funds appropriated to the disposal of the Prov. Com., are applied to sustain this meeting; yet some of this Committee contribute largely to the support of it. *Br. H. L. Hastings,* lately preaching at Plymouth, Mass., is mainly to preach and conduct the meetings at the Hall, tho' the Editor of the Examiner will preach there occasionally. Social meetings in the morning, and preaching afternoon and evening, is the order of services every Sunday.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1854. NO. 3.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street.
TERMS.--One Dollar for the Year;
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

OBEDIENCE TO GOD.

BY THE EDITOR.

[*Concluded from page* 4]

II. THE GROUND OF THEIR CONFIDENCE?

Why did these men continue steadfast under such circumstances?

1. *The word, or Law of God was their supreme rule of action.*

No matter what laws are issued by civil or ecclesiastical rulers, if those laws or decrees contravene the authority of God, no man must obey them, whatever hazard he may run. No plea of "obedience to rulers" will avail any one here; and no man can obey such laws, or decrees, without the guilt of renouncing his allegiance to God. The requirement to obey rulers, civil or ecclesiastical, is based on the ground that they "who rule over men *rule in the fear of God.*" God is the power from which they have received their authority to rule, or else they are *usurpers.* If they have received authority from God to rule, then they are bound to rule according to the *Constitution* God has given for their guide: that Constitution is the Bible or Scriptures of Truth. If, then, any body of rulers do not rule *constitutionally*, or according to the truth of God, their laws and decrees, which are not in harmony with God's law, are null and void. The man who professes allegiance to God and yet obeys such laws, or edicts, is but a hypocritical pretender: he is a rebel against God. God's authority must be supreme with us, or He is *not our God.*

Let us not be misunderstood. We are not teaching resistance by *physical force:* no; but there must not be even a *seeming* obedience to such laws; yet we can endure whatever *penalty* such wicked civil or ecclesiastical despots shall inflict upon us for our choosing to "*obey God rather than men.*" The penalty we can endure without crime on our part; but obey we cannot without the highest sin.

But "this principle," says one, "would overturn government, and bring the laws into contempt." So Nebuchadnezzar thought, and proceeded to act accordingly; but nevertheless the servants of God were unmoved in their purpose to obey God at all hazards; and calmly told the king they would not obey him: the law of their God, to them, was *above* that of the monarch of Babylon: and so it must be to every man, or he is an *idolater.* No human law can bind any man, when such law is clearly opposed to the requirements of God. On this ground stood the three Hebrews. Love to God and trust in him was the ground of their refusal to obey the law of that land, on the occasion under consideration.

The correctness of the principle can be seen by a simple illustration. Suppose a law is enacted which requires that any man meeting another who has but one eye, or one leg, shall smite him to the earth, or be subjected to fine and imprisonment. Could we *obey* such law and be Christians? Certainly not. We could *suffer* the penalty without physical resistance. Let civil and ecclesiastical invaders of God's truth and authority know that their commands, so far as they contravene the commands of God, cannot and will not be obeyed by the servants of God. Thus did the men before us.

2. *A Clear Conscience* was another ground of confidence to these Hebrews. "Our God whom *we serve*," is their language. A good conscience makes a man strong. But such a conscience can only exist when men are governed by the principles of truth, and not by expediency. An expediency man can always find an excuse for violating the demands of truth upon his conscience; and thus he weakens and destroys the voice of conscience, and comes to be incapable of withstanding any temptation to sin. These Hebrews could say, firmly, "*we serve* God:" their consciences did not upbraid them with disregarding His authority. Hence they are strong on the occasion. When men uniformly regard the requirements of God they will have the assurance of His protection and favor, which enables them to suffer for His name.

3. *The Goodness and Mercy of God* formed another link in the chain which led them to confide in Him. "*He will deliver us.*" God is good and will not suffer his faithful ones to be tried above that they are able to bear. There is no ground for supposing that these men had any assurance of *such* a deliverance as they received; but their general knowledge of God's goodness and mercy led them to confide in Him without wavering. "God *will* deliver me;" if not by preserving life now, yet he will deliver me from sin, and hence from *ultimate death*—the wages of sin—is a truth which is based on His mercy and goodness, and forms a ground of confidence in the severest trials. Let these traits of His character ever live in the mind of the ser-

vant of God, and they will make him strong to endure trial.

4. *The Power of God* is another source of confidence to these men. "*Our God is able*," is their noble reply to the king, when he tauntingly asked—"Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" If God is good and merciful, is He as *able* as He is good? *Yes:* What His goodness and mercy prompts Him to do, His *power* can accomplish; so that His servants have nothing to fear *in this* respect. These men could call to mind the power of God as exhibited to their nation in their deliverance out of Egypt—His miracles for the people in the wilderness—and all the various wonders He had wrought for His people in all previous time; and, inspired with the consideration of the facts, could say, "*Our God is able* to deliver us." Happy those who keep alive in their minds the power of that Being who made heaven and earth; for it will make them strong to endure trial in spite of all apparent dangers and threats. On the rock of God's almighty power can we safely rest, while in the path of obedience to His will. These Hebrews found it a rock of strength in their time of need, and rested upon it.

5. *The Promise of God*, tho' not expressed in their reply to the king, doubtless, was in their mind. They might call to mind the promise of God—"When thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned: neither shall the flame kindle upon thee;" Isaiah 43: 2. Though this promise might not have been designed to be understood literally, yet, it could not fail to afford support in the hour of such trial as that these Hebrews were now called to. Happy is the man whose mind is stored with such supports as the promises of God afford.

These men rush not to scenes of danger uncalled of God; nor do they refuse to obey the king of Babylon so long as his laws and commands do not conflict with those of God. At the *command* of the king they come to the dedication of the *image;* for God had never commanded them not to *stand* before an image: so they obey the king up to the utmost limit they were permitted by their allegiance to the God of heaven; but when the king goes a step further, and commands to "*bow down*" to his image, these men refuse; because, *that* God had *forbidden*. Now their regard for God's authority, *as supreme*, is to be tested; and it is found to endure the trial—they will not *bow down* whoever else may do so, or whatever reproach and suffering may be heaped upon them for their non-compliance. They are firm as the rock of God's word upon which they stand. What objects of contempt for the moment—what wonder and amazement is caused by their supposed folly. This leads us to notice—

III. The Consequences of their firmness.

1. *Their enemies were enraged and the hostility increased.* "Nebuchadnezzar was full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed against" these men. "Heat up the furnace," he cries, "one seven times more than it was" usual to be heated."

"What an excitement these men have made!" "How they have disturbed the *peace* of the Church, or State!" "Strange they should be so wilful and obstinate!" Thus men talk, who regard their own superstitions, or popular favor, more than the authority of God. They know nothing of being governed by that authority; and they are astonished that any one else should be. They attribute it to obstinacy, or an insane spirit, because they are ignorant of the power of supreme respect for God's authority.

The self-willed *image* worshippers were enraged because their will was not regarded above the will of God. So it usually is. Civil and ecclesiastical rulers too often fancy they are to be obeyed, and their will not to be opposed, merely because they have become intoxicated with power; and they construe any dissent from their decrees into rebellion against God; forgetting that all men have the right to try their decrees by the unerring rule God has given. But opposition to their will usually raises their *fury* to a flame: so it was anciently; and so it is still. The three Hebrews are, however, unmoved by the tempest that howls around them: their position is taken and they cannot be moved. This leads us to notice another consequence of their firmness; *viz:*

2. *God is glorified in the face of His enemies*: He has an opportunity to manifest His power. Had these men been your time-serving sycophants, who can put God, conscience, and truth, all aside, through fear of displeasing a mortal, or for some more censurable reason, then would the power of God been held in contempt by all the image worshippers assembled on that occasion. But these Hebrews were firm in their purpose to obey God, in face of the greatest danger, and when the most ignominious death appeared before them. Their enemies are terribly aroused, and "the most mighty men in the army" of the king seize them, and bind them in such haste that neither their coats, hats, or other clothing are removed; but they were hurried into the "fiery furnace," and "fell down bound" therein. Filled with haughty exultation, the king and his cringing sycophants, were doubtless ready to conclude they would make it manifest that their *will* was not to be resisted: and that these Hebrews would lose their "*hot zeal*" for their God when the "fiery furnace" was about to receive them. But, look again! What do we see? Nebuchadnezzar's "mighty men," who had performed the office of the tyrant's will, lie *slain* before the "fiery furnace." Hot, indeed, the king had made it; too hot for his own time-serving mighty ones; for they fall dead by the flames they have kindled at his will; yet, God's *obedient ones* are seen "walking *loose* in the midst of the fire!" Surely they must be 'harmed!' Yes, if burning off the cords that bound them was harm; for they are "*loose*." All that civil or ecclesiastical despots can ever do, as to the *ultimate* event, against those who from principle stand firm for the supreme authority of G
greater enlargement;
the losers in the end
preme authority. W
haughty tyrant—"Di
bound into the midst
four men loose, walki
and they have no hurt
—prototype of all oth
or ecclesiastical—true,
harmed! Do you k
God that can deliver
You would not have k
been like the time-ser
and world abounds.
—His name magnifi
humbled and his *im*
brought into conten
Where is that prostr
lously bent on not "d
sacrifice conscience an
mony with "*the chu*
are they now? All g
nace, filled with aston
of the Hebrews had
the great and *golden* i
stands in "the plain o
mirers? No: *not on*
Not one so poor or me
as to pay it the least
kneeling before it?
meanness that nothin
servers of the present
attention from it? A
the God of the Bible
an opportunity to man
power has shown the
character of all humar
the path of uniform
will of God. Such
came from the firm p
His servants, which
other terrible consequ
could shake. And tha
goodness, mercy, and *p*
a faithful heart under t
to which the servants
have, more or less, be
since.

We come to notice,

3. *These Hebrews and confidence.* This *gracious* one, if the p
joy and confidence ti
to; because such char
good conscience. If e
truth has not become
not but feel that they
righteousness to expe
their "golden image,"
down, despite the plain
Maker. Such men nev
the three Hebrews; wh
Supreme, carried out the
life; and God honored
such demonstration of
could not fail to fill the

preme authority of God, is but to give them greater enlargement; and such despots are but the losers in the end by their denial of that supreme authority. What do I see! cries out the haughty tyrant—"Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? Lo, I see *four men* loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt." True, haughty tyrant—prototype of all other tyrants, whether civil or ecclesiastical—true, they are loose, and unharmed! Do you know now "Who is that God that can deliver out of" your "hands?" You would not have known, had these Hebrews been like the time-servers with which our land and world abounds. But now God is honored—His name magnified—the haughty tyrant humbled and his *image*—his *golden* image—brought into contempt. What do we see? Where is that prostrate company—so scrupulously bent on not "disturbing the peace," as to sacrifice conscience and principle, to be in harmony with "*the church*," or State! Where are they now? All gazing into the fiery furnace, filled with astonishment at what the God of the Hebrews had wrought! Where now is the great and *golden* image! Look at it, as it stands in "the plain of Dura!" Has it any admirers? No: *not one.* All have forsaken it. Not one so poor or mean, in all the vast crowd, as to pay it the least respect, or to be found kneeling before it? No: it has sunk into a meanness that nothing can equal but the time-servers of the present age. What has called off attention from it? Ah, the faithful servants of the God of the Bible have given their Sovereign an opportunity to manifest His power, and that power has shown the contemptible and wicked character of all human policy that shrinks from the path of uniform obedience to the known will of God. Such a result, to God's honor, came from the firm principle in the breasts of His servants, which no flatteries, threats, or other terrible consequences, real or imaginary, could shake. And that manifestation of God's goodness, mercy, and *power*, has sustained many a faithful heart under the trials and temptations to which the servants of the Most High God have, more or less, been subject in all periods since.

We come to notice,

3. *These Hebrews have an increase of joy and confidence.* This is a natural result; or a *gracious* one, if the phrase suits better. This joy and confidence time-servers are strangers to; because such characters never can have a good conscience. If every spark of light and truth has not become extinct in such, they cannot but feel that they have sacrificed truth and righteousness to expediency; that has been *their* "golden image," to which they have fallen down, despite the plain commands of God their Maker. Such men never can know the bliss of the three Hebrews; who, acknowledging God as Supreme, carried out their principles in *practical life;* and God honored them, and gave them such demonstration of His love and care as could not fail to fill them with joy unspeakable and full of glory; all of which they would have come short of had they given way under the pressure of circumstances. Henceforth, *the experience* of the past is added to all other considerations to comfort their minds in the firm obedience to their God and attachment to His service.

4. *Their enemies were put to silence.* Most men, who live in the sacrifice of principle to expediency, suppose they gain by such a course. But, gain or lose, at present, such a course must ultimate in crushing their manhood, as well as their religion; while the opposite cause exalts their manhood, and always improves their moral character, as well as ultimately silencing their enemies. This was peculiarly so in the case under consideration. In the result, the proud monarch, who had defied the God of these men (verse 15) was forced to acknowledge that "no other God can deliver after this sort;" and a royal decree is drawn forth, from Nebuchadnezzar, that no man, in all his vast dominions, should "speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrack, Meshack, and Abednego." This decree must be carried home by those time-serving princes, governors, captains, judges, &c., who had come to do homage to the "golden image," and who had fallen down thereto; but are now compelled to return home, not with the praise of the image, but with the astonishing intelligence that the God of heaven is above all other gods, and that His servants—faithful to His commands—are henceforth to have full liberty to honor Him, not only unmolested, but none are to speak anything against Him. Thus were the contemners of Israel's God silenced by the faithful obedience of His servants, and the manifestation of His power; for which their obedience gave occasion.

IMPROVEMENT.—1. *We learn the blessedness of those who faithfully serve God.* Reflection on the bliss or joy these men must have experienced, under all the circumstances over which they were enabled to triumph, will convince any mind that the consideration, that they were kept from dishonoring God in the hour of trial, and that their firmness was made the occasion of a richer and more glorious display of the excellency and power of the God they loved, and the spread of His fame abroad, must have imparted a blessedness to them which would prove lasting as life itself. Such a bliss time-servers fail to secure, and sometimes die of mortification and disappointment.

2. *We learn that there is no necessity for abandoning right principles, or for complying with wicked customs.* After the considerations already set before us, in contemplating this subject, we have no need to enlarge on this reflection; and we name it only to impress the truth on the mind. May it never be obliterated therefrom.

3. *We learn that God can and does get honor to Himself by His faithful people in spite of their enemies.*

4. *We learn that God will not suffer those who adhere to right principles or to His truth,*

to be tried above what they are able to bear, but will now or ultimately deliver them.

5. *We see the honor that God puts upon His faithful servants.*

6. *Let* US *learn to* OBEY *God under* ALL CIRCUMSTANCES, *and at* ALL TIMES. No plea can ever answer for an opposite course; and we can have no excuse, in view of this subject, for concealing an attachment to God's truth and authority. Openly, fearlessly, yet calmly, let us maintain both: and remember, Jesus hath said, "*Whoever* shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Mark 8: 38. Solemn words these. May we heed the warning.

IMMORTAL-SOULISTS IN TROUBLE.—We clip the following *Criticism* on *Hymns* and *Psalms* from the *Presbyterian Herald*, Louisville, Ky.; DR. HILL editor. He says:

The Due West Telescope, the organ of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, quotes our criticism upon the phrase sometimes applied to departed Christians, in obituary notices, that "*they are no more*," and then adds a similar criticism upon one of the hymns in the General Assembly's collection. In reference to our remark the editor says:

"That is very well said, Dr. Hill. But what better is the sentiment of hymn 610 in the collection issued by your Board, and approved by your Assembly, and which, if we may judge from the frequency of its use, is among the most popular in the collection? To show that it is a favorite, it is only necessary to say that it commences: 'Life is the time to serve the Lord,' &c. We quote the third, fourth and sixth verses, and italicise the words and phrases that excite the 'wonder' of a *psalm singer* about as much as would the expression, Mr. A. B. is no more.' Will you please explain for our satisfaction the words in italics, and show their consistency with the doctrines known as the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future general judgment? The verses are:

3 The living know that they must die,
But all the dead *forgotten lie;*
Their memory and their sense are gone,
Alike unknowing and unknown.

4 *Their hatred and their love are lost,*
Their envy buried in the dust;
They have no share in all that's done
Beneath the circuit of the sun.

6 There are no acts of pardon past
In the cold grave to which we haste;
But darkness, death and long despair
Reign in eternal silence there."

With all due deference we must be allowed to express the opinion that our esteemed brother has been looking into our hymn book with green spectacles astride his nose. His zeal for Rouse's version has blinded his vision we fear. If he will turn to the ninth chapter of Ecclesiastes he will there find almost the identical expressions which he has italicised as objectionable in the hymn. Indeed the 610th hymn is a sort of running paraphrase on the verses we quote below: "For the living know that they shall die; but *the dead know not anything;* neither have they any more a reward; *for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun.*" "For there is no work nor device nor knowledge nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." In his own favorite version of the Psalms he will find expressions very similar to those he objects to. For example in the 6th Psalm, we have such verses as these:

"Because those that deceased are
Of thee shall no remembrance have,
And who is he that will to thee
Give praises lying in the grave?"

Or again:

"Because of thee in death there shall
No more remembrance be,
Of those that in the grave do lie,
Who shall give thanks to thee?"

Now we take it for granted that our esteemed brother frequently sings these verses very devoutly in the worship of the sanctuary. And yet, how he can consistently do so, and then turn round and reproach his General Assembly brethren for singing their favorite hymn which contains the same sentiment, couched almost in the very words of Scripture, and in far better rythm and measure, in our poor judgment, than Rouse has expressed it, we cannot clearly see. If we take the term *grave* in the sixth verse of the General Assembly's hymn literally, the lines may be somewhat objectionable; but we presume that it is meant to include, as it sometimes does in Scripture, the invisible world, the place of departed spirits, as well as bodies. In that sense it is literally true, that "darkness, death and long despair reign in eternal silence there." At least it is not harder to be explained consistently with the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the general judgment, than Rouse's expression, "those that deceased are, of thee shall no remembrance have." If our brother will explain that, we will explain, by the same process, the 610th hymn.

DR. HILL does the best he can to wipe off the stain of these Hymns lacking harmony with immortal-soulism and the Bible; how well he succeeds others can judge. The trouble is, neither he, nor his adverse brother critic, can make these Hymns or the Bible to harmonize with the fable of an immortal soul in man. *That is more than both these D. D.'s can do.* Let them try again.

DESTINY OF THE SPIRIT.

"For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other: yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, all turn to dust again. Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"—ECCL. CHAP. 3. 19—21.

To question the immortality and separate state of the human soul, is considered by many, who are not accustomed to reflect on this subject, as endangering the foundations of the Christian faith, and therefore every attempt to show the unscriptural character of this doctrine, is regarded by such persons with pious indignation and alarm. It is passing strange, that what is reputed to be a foundation truth, should never once be recognized in that Book which contains this Divine system of revealed religion! The Christianity of the Churches may need to enrol this philosophical conceit among the things to be believed, but the Christianity of the Bible finds no place for, neither will it endure it. It has been commonly supposed, however, that the last verse of the text which heads this tract teaches at least, the separate state and personality of the human soul, and by contrasting its destiny with that of the spirit of the beast, implies also its immortality. The judgment of the candid reader is invited to the following expository remarks.

In the 19th verse it is stated, both of men and of beasts, "they have all one *breath*." Now this word *breath* is the *same* Hebrew word as is twice translated '*spirit*' in the 21st verse. It is proper to ask what reason had our translators to depart from a uniform translation of this word in the three places above mentioned? If they rendered the Hebrew word by the word *spirit*, in verse 21, they should have adopted the same word in verse 19, and hence it should have been translated, not "they all have one *breath*;" but "they have all one *spirit*." But the translators were believers in the separate state and immortality of the human soul, and their opinions, therefore, on this subject, could not endure to read, both of man and beast, "yea, they have all *one spirit*;" and thus they preferred the literal rendering of *breath* in this place. And this word *breath* ought to have been preserved throughout the whole connected passage, and not another word, *spirit*, have been employed twice in the 21st verse, as the proper equivalent of the same original word. Thus "Who knoweth the *breath* of man that goeth upward, and the *breath* of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?"

As to the *breath of man* going *upward*, and the *breath of the beast* going *downward* to the earth, it is only necessary for its explanation, to remember that it is written, "*God breathed* into *man* the *breath* of life;" it is not written that *God breathed* into the *beast*, although of course God kindled in the inferior animals "the breath of life" also. The *breath of man* therefore, may be appropriately said to go *upward to God* who gave it, without supposing that it is the soul or spirit of man that returns to God in death, as the disembodied human personality.

But this verse must be read in connection with what precedes it, from which it will be evident that no emphasis can be laid upon the correlative words, *upward* and *downward*. So far was Solomon from designing to make a distinction in favor of man, in these verses, that he states in the most decided and emphatic manner, that the *destinies* of man and beast, (in the condition of death) are *identical*. "*For that*," he says, "*which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts;* even *one thing* befalleth them; *as* the *one* dieth, *so* dieth the other; yea, *they have all one breath*, so that a *man hath* NO PRE-EMINENCE *above a beast;* for all is vanity. ALL *go unto* ONE PLACE, *all* are of the dust, and *all* turn to dust again."

Now I would ask, if the spirit of man goes *upward*, in the sense commonly understood,—and the spirit of the beast goes *downward*, how could Solomon have written just before, "*that* which befalleth the *sons of men*, befalleth *beasts;* even *one thing* befalleth them?" How could Solomon have written "*As* the *one* dieth, *so* dieth the *other*?" How, if one goeth '*upward*,' and the other '*downward*,' can '*all go unto* ONE PLACE?' How could Solomon have affirmed "*so that a man hath* NO PRE-EMINENCE *above a beast*?"

There is no obstacle to the harmonious interpretation of this passage, if we read the 21st verse as it should be read,—substituting the word *breath* for *spirit*. Into man *God breathed* the *breath* of life, and man became a living soul: and in death the breath is most appropriately said to return to God who gave it—not as some ethereal substance, instinct with life, and possessed of conscious personality—but in the sense of its being withdrawn by him who imparted it.

It is, moreover, worth remarking that there is a strong reason for concluding that the translators of this passage failed to give the precise meaning which Solomon intended to convey. The oldest version of the Sacred Scriptures, known as the Septuagint or Greek translation of the seventy, and also the Latin Vulgate, and Luther's German Bible, translate this verse as follows: "Who knoweth *whether* the breath of man goeth upward, and *whether* the breath of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" This translation represents Solomon as challenging the knowledge of men to contradict his assertion that "*all go unto* ONE PLACE, *so that a man hath* NO PRE-EMINENCE *above a beast.*" This is probably the meaning of the passage.

It is not generally understood, but it is nevertheless true, that the Bible gives no scientific information concerning the composition of our nature, and that the words *soul* and *body* were

used by the sacred writers in a popular, and not philosophical sense, each word signifying commonly, the *whole human nature.* Thus, in Numb. 31: 19, we read: "Whosoever hath killed any *person;*" in the Hebrew it is "Whosoever hath killed any *soul;*"—meaning of course, 'any *person.*' Thus, too, Paul wrote, "Present your *bodies* a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God."—Romans 12: 1. Paul could not mean that Christians were to present their *mere bodies* to God, but *their entire selves,* in a life of consecrated service. The Scriptures speak of man as a compound being, but never use the word *soul* or *spirit* in the modern sense, as being the *man, distinct from* the body, as if this were but the receptacle of the man;—this notion is purely a human speculation, and is a tradition of the ancient heathen philosophers, adopted, and transmitted to us, by certain Christian teachers, styled 'the Fathers,' subsequent to the Apostolic age. We are not therefore to enquire into *the state of the soul* or *spirit* after death, because we know nothing of its *distinct* existence; the Scriptures tell us of the state of the compound being, called *man*—"*Man* giveth up the ghost, (literally *expires,*) and where is *he?*" Not where is his *soul,* but where is *he, man?* To which, it is replied, "*Man* (the whole human being) lieth down, and riseth not: *till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, or be raised out of their sleep.*"—Job 14: 10—12. *While dead,* man *as entirely ceases to be* as the beast: and so '*a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.*' But man will RISE AGAIN. "This," said Jesus Christ, "is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have *Everlasting Life:* and I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."—John 6: 40.—*Rev. J. Panton Ham.*

CLEMENS, ROMANUS, ORIGEN, JUSTIN MARTYR and others, were, before their conversion to Christianity, Platonic philosophers. The speculative opinions which they held concerning the soul as a distinct subsistence they carried with them into the new faith. The importance which they attached to their doctrine of the soul's immortality as an independent being may be seen by the following account which CLEMENS gives of himself: "As such thoughts, then, dwelt in me from my childhood, I resorted to the schools of the philosophers, hoping to find some certain foundation on which I could repose: and I saw nothing but building up and tearing down of theories,—nothing but endless dispute and contradiction: sometimes, for example, the demonstration triumphed of the soul's immortality, then again, of its mortality. When the former prevailed I rejoiced; when the latter, I was depressed."

"There could not fail to arise, then," writes Neander, "out of this school (the Platonic) itself, an opposition of views: on the one side were those who held this position in hostility to Christianity; on the other those to whom it proved a point of transition to Christianity. But, then, the latter again, were exposed to a peculiar danger. *Their earlier prejudices might re-act in such a way as to pervert their mode of apprehending and of shaping Christian truth. In this way much foreign matter, drawn from their previous opinions, might unconsciously be conveyed over with them to Christianity.*"—*Church History,* vol. i. p. 47.

GIESELER, writing of the second century, observes, "*A speculative treatment of Christian doctrine* was generally indispensable, if Christianity should be accessible to the philosophical culture of the times, and was rendered unavoidable by the measures of the Gnostics. It could only proceed from *Platonism,* which, of all philosophical systems, stood the nearest to Christianity. While many Platonic philosophers were brought over to Christianity by this internal relation, they received the latter as the most perfect philosophy, and retained with their philosophical mantle *their philosophical turn of mind also.*" They set out with this assumption, "*that the truth taught by Plato was derived from Moses and the prophets.* Thus, then, *they overvalued even the actual greement of Plato with Christianity, and believed that they found many a Platonic idea in the latter,* WHICH IN REALITY THEY THEMSELVES HAD FIRST INTRODUCED INTO IT."—*Compend of Eccles. History,* vol. i, p. 162.—Trans. Clark's For. Theol. Lib.—*Note to Ham's Theological Tracts.*

THE BLOOD IS THE SOUL.

BY ELD. E. R. PINNEY.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

1. "If *the blood* is *the soul proper,* was not Christ's *soul left* in *sheol?* for, he was 'quickened by *the spirit.*'"

ANS.—It was not. It was taken by Jesus our High Priest into Heaven; for thus it is written (Murdock's translation is given because the idea is clearer rather, than in our version,) "But the Messiah who came, was a high priest of the good things which he wrought; and he entered into the great and perfect tabernacle, which was not made with hands, and was not made of these created things. And he did not enter with the blood of goats and calves: but *with* THE BLOOD OF HIMSELF, he entered once into the sanctuary, and obtained eternal redemption * * * For the Messiah entered not into the sanctuary made with hands which is the emblem of the true (sanctuary): but he ENTERED INTO HEAVEN ITSELF, to appear in the presence of God for us." Heb. 9: 11, 12, 24. Read also verses 14 and 22.

Hence we see that his blood was not left in sheol, neither did it animate his resurrected body Blood is too dense, too slow, and sluggish as a circulating medium in the bodies of the resurrected saints, who are to be equal in speed, power, &c., to the angels. Nothing but the pure *ruach* will answer for immortals. Consequently

Jesus the first fruits was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:" 1 Peter 3: 18. "Sown a *soulical* body, (i. e., a body animated by blood) but *raised* a *spiritual* body." 1 Cor 15: 44. For "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES by HIS SPIRIT that dwelleth in you." Romans 8: 11. All the saints at the resurrection therefore, are to be quickened by the same spirit that raised Jesus from the dead, as a medium of life to their bodies.

2. "If Christ's soul (*blood*) was not left in *sheol* (or *hades*) how can he *inherit* the kingdom of God? 1 Cor. 15: 50."

This objection is already answered above. The expression, "Flesh and blood," I understand to mean flesh animated by blood—i. e. corruptible—and so explained in the last clause of the verse, "Neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." Our inheritance is to be incorruptible; hence *we* must be incorruptible. Therefore all alive at Christ's coming will be changed "in the twinkling of an eye"—the circulating medium will be changed from *blood* to pure *Ruah*—from corruption to incorruption—from a *soulical* to a *spiritual* body. The same would have been effected by eating of the tree of life.

3. "If flesh and blood (the soul) cannot inherit the kingdom of God," as Paul saith, then the soul seems not redeemed; and hence must *in all cases* perish."

ANS.—Christ did not die to redeem men's souls, nor spirits, nor heads, or feet, but the whole man. *Men* are to be saved. Wherever soul is thus used it is synecdochically to represent the whole man. The whole man sinned—fell—died, and is to be redeemed. Amen.

4. "If the blood is the soul, and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, why should Paul wish it *preserved blameless* unto the coming of the Lord? 1 Thess. 5: 23."

ANS.—Because he wished the *entire* man preserved free from blame, or sin, for "without holiness," &c.; and the three terms, "body, soul, and spirit," only included the "*you*" in the first part of the sentence, and answered to the term "*wholly*" in the preceding sentence; and had he, like the Catholics in cursing, extended the enumeration to the head, feet, eyes, mouth, &c., even to the toe nails, he could have included no more than the "*you*" or "thou" representing the person.

5. "When God saith *my soul* loatheth them [Zach. 11: 8.] could it be HIS *blood* that he spoke of? And in the same verse when he said 'Their *soul* also abhorred me'—could he mean their blood?"

ANS.—The term Nephesh (soul) is a Hebraism for the reflexive pronouns I, me, my, thyself, himself, &c. The work, "Bible vs. Tradition" would have told you that, and you see Whiting, in his translation of Nephesh, very often renders it with reference to this fact. Then the passage would read, stripped of its figure, "I loath them, *they* also abhorred me." This answers your 6th objection, "Why am I cast down?" &c., and all similar passages.

7. "If *the soul, proper*, is the blood, then the soul being *corruptible*, were we not redeemed with a 'corruptible thing?' 1 Peter 1: 18."

ANS.—This objection is based upon a supposed contrast of corruptibility between silver and gold and blood, which is not a necessary implication. Murdock's translation removes, measurably, the obscurity—"Ye know, that neither with PERISHABLE silver, nor with gold, ye were redeemed * * * but with the *precious* blood of that Lamb in which is no spot," &c. The idea is that salvation could not be bought with money; and adds, that blood was the price, even the *precious* (not corruptible nor incorruptible, but '*precious*') blood of Christ. Why? Because "without shedding of blood there is no remission." And the blood of calves nor goats, nor men, nor angels would avail. It must be the only begotten Son of God, for "the altar sanctifieth the gift;" (Math 23: 19.) nor yet could he have satisfied the claims of the law without passing by the nature of angels and taking upon him "the seed of Abraham"—"part flesh and blood"—a "soulical" (or blood) body, which he received through Mary—hence, of necessity he must come not only by water, but by water and blood, so emphatically repeated by John.—"This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by WATER and *blood*." 1 John 5: 6.

8. "Did Christ *actually* die by his blood being 'poured out?' Or, in other words, was it the *loss of blood* that caused his death? And if so, Did his blood go into his *grave?*"

ANS.—God says, the blood is the *Nephesh* (Gen. 9: 4.) Again, that "He (Christ) made his *Nephesh* an offering for sin"—"He *poured out* his *Nephesh* unto death." Isaiah 53: 10, 12. This is the Bible testimony. If Christ did not fulfil it, he is not the Saviour. His blood went into the grave (the earth) before his body did. I consider the earth the great charnel-house or grave of death. And a man goes into *sheol* whether you dig a hole in the ground, or in a rock above or below the ground—or raise a mound in any way above it, or sink him in the sea. Christ's blood went into the ground at the foot of the cross. "The wicked shall be turned into *sheol* with," &c. Psalms 9: 17; and they are to be devoured by fire, which is the second death. Rev. 20: 9; 21: 8. I do not see the distinction between Kever and Sheol that some would make.

"DIALOGUES ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT," by *Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff*, Scotland. This work is calculated to interest and instruct on the subject of immortality. Many of them have been circulated in this country. It is a 12 mo. pamphlet of 60 pages, and has been sold at 15 cents; but we have concluded to *reduce* the price to *ten* cents single; and $6 per 100. We have just published a *new* edition.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1854.

OUR OLD SUBSCRIBERS have more generally renewed than we had expected; and have done it, too, with a promptness that is truly gratifying; so that our list is considerably in advance of last year at this time; but we still lack about $200 of enough to pay for paper, and the printer's bill, for our *semi-monthly* issue. Hence before the Editor can receive any compensation for his services, 200 more paying subscribers must be added. May that not be done at once? Will our patrons see if they cannot send at least *one* more subscriber *each*, immediately? If they can, and *all* do it, then the Examiner and its Editor will be provided for. This will enable him to give his time more entirely to the paper: and he trusts thereby to give a better one, than if his mind should be encumbered with exertions for sustenance for his "household;" for which if a man does "not provide" he has "denied the faith, and is *worse than an infidel.*" So saith Paul, the apostle.

The effort is desirable at this time especially, as he must regulate, definitely, the number of papers to be printed at each issue, for the year.

"MATERIALISM."—"Rev. Nathan George" published nine articles in Zion's Herald, the Methodist Episcopal paper in Boston, in which he professed to "examine and refute the doctrines of George Storrs." In those articles, however, he says but little of our writings, but takes a pamphlet by Z. Campbell for examination. Nevertheless, we have thought best to give him a little attention for the sake of the truth. We will proceed with our dialogue commenced in the December Examiner. We should have been glad, as we have before said, if Br. George had commenced where we commenced, with the Mosaic account of creation, and shown that we were in error, and "anti-scriptural," in our views of the fact that man was created a *material* being; and then followed us—not Br. Campbell—in our argument to its conclusion, *viz:* that it is the will of God that no man shall have immortality, or endless life, except he forms a moral character in harmony with his Maker's. Thus "God formed *man* of the dust of the ground;" and having inspired him into consciousness, by the "*breath* of life," He placed him under *a law* for the development of a *moral character*—which man had not by creation, and could not have except by trial under a law. The Creator informed this man, that if he developed opposition to His will, or law, he should "*surely die.*" This law implied, if the man developed a moral character in harmony with the divine will he should *not die*, but live forever, or have *Eternal Life.* The explanation of the penalty, by the Law-giver, shows that it was simply, "*Dust thou art*, and unto dust shalt *thou return.*" Man should go back to that state from which his Creator brought him, and "be as though" he "had not been." That such was the determination of the Creator further appears from the fact, that after man sinned he was excluded from "the tree of life, lest he should take and eat thereof and live forever." There is no hint in any part of the whole transaction of an "immaterial" something in man which did not fall under the explained penalty of the law; the entire man was to be dissolved by death; so his Maker explained the matter; and it is for our opponents to disprove this position if they can. That Br. George could not do it, is sufficiently evident from the fact that he does not venture near the foundation, or root, of the question, but dashes off to some of the extreme branches; as though he thought, if some branch could be weakened the tree must fall. Why not take off his coat, and go at the root or trunk of the tree at once? Perhaps it was *too* "*material.*" Then, surely, he would not have had to "beat the air." Well, he has chosen his own way, and we will notice some of his sayings.

EXAMINER.—We hope, Br. George, you will not think us unkind for so long an introduction to our renewed conversation. We are not conscious of unkindness; and intend to love you none the less because you do not yet see as we do, that there is "no future life and immortality except through Jesus Christ alone; and that by a resurrection at the last day." What have you to say on Eccl. 9: 10—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might: for there is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge*, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest?"

GEORGE.—"This affords no proof whatever that the soul dies with the body. We readily admit that all of man that goes into the grave retains none of these attributes named in the text, for the spirit of man does not go there, as the dust only returns "to the earth as it was," (Eccl. 12: 7.) Furthermore, we learn from the

Saviour that the soul does not die when the body is killed. (Matt. 10: 28.)"

EXR.—You are careful to conceal the fact that the term "*grave*," in this text is not *kever*, in the original, but *sheol*. It is not the term for grave, as now used in common conversation, but relates to the *state of man in death;* the "covered" state into which *the man* enters at death. Into this state "*the soul*" does go, as saith the Psalmist, Psalms 89: 48—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the *grave?* Selah." *Mark this*, Br. George. In that state David, Solomon, and Hezekiah all affirm there is "*no knowledge*"—no praising God: and your *assumption* to the contrary finds no support in Eccl. 12: 7, unless Solomon contradicts himself, which is not likely. Your text, Matt. 10: 28, gives no countenance to the theory of the *conscious* existence of any part of man when he is dead. On that text, however, we refer you to an article in the Examiner, for January 15, by "Rev. J. Panton Ham," England.

What have you to say on Romans 2: 7—"To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life?"

GEO.—"It is said that immortality is something to be sought for: but why seek it, if the soul is immortal? Immortality is the quality of never ceasing to exist, or exemption from death, and does not imply either happiness or misery. Now, as men seek only for that which they deem desirable, it cannot be merely existence that the apostle speaks of; but something to be desired in connection with that existence; hence, we may conclude with certainty that the word *blissful* added to it expresses the sense designed. This we think must be obvious to all."

EXR.—We thought you would find it necessary to "*add*" to the testimony of God; so, "*blissful*" comes to your aid. But this helps you not; for, you have defined "immortality" to be "the quality of never ceasing to exist, or *exemption from death.*" Now, the same apostle, in the same epistle, chap. 6: 23, saith, "The wages of sin *is death.*" Hence the wicked have not an "*exemption* from death," and therefore are *not* immortal, you being judge. But you say, "immortality does not imply either happiness or misery." This is a pure *assumption*, without a particle of proof in the Bible, or in philosophy. Misery—so far as we have any knowledge—is, invariably, connected with *mortality* and corruptibility. Show us an immortal creature that suffers if you can. We believe the thing is impossible—in the very nature of the case. Surely immortality—*deathlessness*—is something "*desirable;*" really worth *seeking for.* That state excludes all sorrow and pain; and hence implies the presence of all that is desirable. We do not need to add "*blissful.*" It is blissful, indeed; and it is so because it is immortal, deathless, incorruptible; and it is gained only through Christ, the second Adam, and by a resurrection at the last day. "I will raise *him* up at the last day," saith Jesus, four times in one discourse, John 6th. Believe it, Br. G., and rejoice in the truth, that Life, Eternal Life—even immortality and incorruptibility—is "the *gift* of God, through Jesus Christ" to all "them, who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for it."

MODERN DIVINITY.—A friend has sent us a sketch of a sermon preached in this city, at "Green-street Methodist Episcopal Church," by "*Rev. Dr. R. S. Foster,*" the pastor. The sketch is cut from some newspaper report; and the sermon is said to have been a "*very impressive* discourse." Text Matt. 16: 26, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul," &c. Dr. Foster is reported to have said—

"The word rendered 'soul' in this text is rendered 'very life' in many passages of the Scriptures, having no other significance than natural life. We are obliged, therefore, in many passages, to depend upon the context to find its meaning. In this text, however, it stands for the spirit—the latent principle that is within us all."

It is true the word rendered soul—*psucheen*—in this text, is rendered "*life* in many passages," &c. Why does Dr. F. *assume* that here "it stands for *spirit?*" He knows, or he is a misnamed *Dr.*, that *pneuma* is the Greek term for *spirit:* and the two terms *psuche* and *pneuma* are never used interchangably in the Scriptures; but are entirely distinct. His *assumption* is purely gratuitous, and without any authority except his mere *ipsi dixit.* Luke tells us distinctly, chap. 9: 25, that the thing *lost* is the man "*himself:*" hence, that "*life*" proper is the loss spoken of. The same word occurs four times in Matt. 16: 25, 26; *twice* rendered *life* and twice *soul*, the absurdity of which is manifest from Luke's version of the same discourse. Dr. Foster gives not one solitary text of Scripture—so far as the report goes—for his assumption. Again, Dr. Foster says—

"God intended, in the production of the human soul, that it should never die—that it should be endowed with immortal life—that its existence should be perpetual. The soul is never to die—never to cease to exist! It may die in the sense of being perverted, but not of perishing, so as to cease to be."

What "God *intended*" is one thing; and what will be the *actual result* is another, and may be a very different thing. This Dr. Foster must admit, or he lands in Universalism; for he says, in the next sentence, "God made it for the enjoyment of Himself, to live with Him forever." That is, "God intended" the soul to *enjoy Himself* forever. Will God's intention fail? will it be frustrated? Dr. F. and his associates in the belief of endless misery think, in this matter, God's intention may be frustrated. How then can they demonstrate—even if it be true that "God *intended* the human soul should never die"—that it will not die—yea, cease to exist? They cannot do it; they never have done it; and it is impossible for them ever to do it while the Scriptures abound in testimony that, "The soul that sinneth *it* SHALL DIE;" and "he that converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save A SOUL *from death*." Ezk. 18: 4, 20, and James 5: 20. Not one text of Scripture has Dr. F. and his fellows in immortal-soulism in support of the bold assertion that "The soul is never to die—never to cease to exist," &c. Such assumptions contradict the testimony of the Spirit of God; and they are assuming a fearful responsibility who use them. Let them keep "to the law and the testimony," remembering that if they "speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8: 20.

We tell these theologians once more, that unless they abandon their assumed premises, they are inevitably to be swept into restorationism with their flocks. The God dishonoring doctrine of endless sin and suffering will not bear the light: it is doomed *to die: it is too sick to live.* No wonder there are so many "*Doctors of Divinity;*" but the patient will die after all.

"EAT HER FLESH AND BURN HER WITH FIRE."—So speaketh the voice of prophecy. Again, "The *waters* where the Harlot sitteth are *peoples*," &c., saith the same sure word: therefore, when the "*people*" are *withdrawn* from her, and the "*Scarlet colored Beast*" shall turn away from her support, then will vengeance fall upon her to the utmost. Let the following be pondered, in view of the prophecy Rev. 17. It was sent in to a recent meeting of the "Republican Society" in this city. The writer, we judge, was well informed on the subject.

FEELING AT ROME.

NEW YORK, Monday, Jan. 9, 1854.

To Col. FORBES—*Dear Sir*: I can certainly have no objection to answer the question made in connection with my name at your last meeting, in which information was asked respecting the feelings of the Romans toward the Pope and his Government; though on the present occasion I am able to write but a few lines. Should I find time subsequently to convey at a greater length the impressions which I received through my contact with the Romans, the substance of my testimony would be to show that I regard Roman Catholicism as dead in Rome; nine-tenths of the people, including the female portion of the population, looking on the Pope and his Cardinals with contempt as spiritual impostors, and with the utmost hatred and horror as temporal oppressors.

From what I heard and saw I feel convinced, and am willing to place on record my conviction, that within twenty-four hours after the withdrawal of the foreign garrison the Pope's Government will have fallen, and his own life, together with those of his Cardinals and counsellors will have been sacrificed, unless they can save themselves by flight or concealment, which will be very difficult.

Every avenue of escape is noted and watched. The popular feeling of the Romans has been so embittered by the manifold executions, imprisonments, treacheries and oppressions of their rulers, that I regret to say I found the popular leaders inexorably deaf to any councils of moderation and mercy; deliberating merely whether the Holy Father should be hanged from the cross of St. Peter's, or over the so-called tomb of St. Peter within; the least violent stipulating only that he should be unfrocked as a false priest, and then tried like Charles Ist for violating his contract with and murdering his people.

I am, Dear Sir,

CHARLES FRED. HENNINGSEN.

A TROUBLE.—"I have a trouble about the identity of the *raised.* As you hold, it seems a new creation after the old type, and there could be two or ten thousand 'raised' as properly from the same type and identity. Can you throw light on this troublesome (not to me alone) point?" D. H. C,

The foregoing *trouble* makes us think of Nicodemus, who said, "How can these things be?" and of Paul's remark, "Some man will say, How are *the dead* raised up, and with what body do they [the dead] come?" Do such persons not "Err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God?" No man can have more than *one* "*identity.*" *That* he must have in

the resurrection, or it is no resurrection at all. The word and truth of God are pledged to raise up the dead in Christ, "at the last day. Has God said it, and can He not do it?" Only admit His *omnipotence*, and be satisfied that He has promised it, and faith will find no fears left of being raised "ten thousand" instead of the same *one* and *identical person* who fell asleep. If our troubled friend wishes us to go into philosophical speculations on the matter, we must leave that to the disbelievers in God's power, who have supplied an immortal soul as an excuse for their unbelief.

"PROF. MAURICE" ONCE MORE.—Dr. Lees, Leeds, England, has sent us a scrap, cut we suppose from an English paper. It is headed "*The London Inquisition.*" It reads as follows:—

"The Principal and Council of King's College London, have just been making a sad spectacle of themselves. It seems that one of the Professors of the institution, a Rev. Mr. Maurice, had some critical notions about the Greek word *aionion*, which our translators of the Bible render "eternal;" and he took occasion to speak out his views respecting said word, in a lecture he recently delivered. This gave the alarm to the Principal, Dr. Jelf, who immediately wrote to the Professor, to explain whether he intended to question the orthodox doctrine of eternal punishment. The Professor replied that he believed in the eternal punishment of the wicked, in the New Testament sense of the phrase; but that he did not believe in it as some did; he thought that thousands of British youths under their instruction ought to have right conceptions of the matter; and hence he spoke out in the lecture. This was still more alarming to the pragmatical old Doctor, at the head of the heap, and so he convened the inquisition, *alias* the Collegiate Council, and they, by the aid of old Pope Jelf, excommunicated Professor Maurice from the College and delivered him over to Satan—the fate of all heretics. The Professor has appealed from this decision, alleging that his assumed judges had no jurisdiction in the case, inasmuch as he is accountable only to God and his ecclesiastical diocesan for his religious opinions, and not to his officers in the College.

Whether this appeal be right or wrong, we know not, having no access to the charter and constitution of the Seminary. But this we say, it is a bold and unwarranted step to take in these enlightened and tolerant times. Let us see, the Church of England, that it may hold all the fish coming to its net, opens its bosom wide enough to receive Calvinists, Arminians, Socinians, and the idolators and image-worshippers of the corrupt Church of Rome. Ay, old Pusey himself may still fill the Hebrew chair in the highest University of the realm, even though his heresy is rank, and smells to heaven, if not to hell. But Professor Maurice must be cut off, and sent a beggar upon the streets, because he doubts the unphilosophical fact, that brimstone and fire coming in contact will not at last burn out! It seems the Professor thinks with Bailey, the author of *Festus, that the eternal punishment of the wicked will be their total destruction*, wherein sin shall be destroyed; and by the power of Christ a new creation shall succeed, wherein shall "dwell righteousness;" and those who have once lived and been destroyed, shall be raised up in the new creation, and there shall be no more sin, or death, but "sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Whether the Professor's notions are right or wrong, is nothing to the point. If he is in error, he is in company with many others in the Church, whose speculative opinions are much more objectionable than his. We have known many very worthy and good men, who doubted that a benevolent Deity would make erring mortals eternally wretched, for a finite offence; and we do not think this sentiment an unworthy view of the attributes of a God of love.

But say it is an error; yet we protest against an old dogmatical bigot having the power to crucify unto death for such an error. This shows us what we have often seen and deplored, the sad condition of our seats of learning in this country, while under the thumb of narrow minded bigotted priests. Tell of having escaped from the intolerance and persecution of Rome! —it is all an empty boast, so long as such creatures as Dr. Jelf can ruin his professors, and send them to Coventry, for believing a little more or a little less than he does.

The foregoing is a just and merited rebuke of DR. JELF; and may apply with equal propriety to all such as keep up the cry of "*infidelity*" against those, in this country, who maintain "Life and Immortality are only through Jesus Christ," and "all the wicked will He destroy." Whether PROF. MAURICE is with us, in this view, we have not been able yet to determine. One expression in the foregoing would seem to be in agreement with our view of the end of the wicked; but the following words appear to express a contrary idea, if they really convey the view of the PROFESSOR. The words we refer to are these, "Those who have once lived and been destroyed, shall be raised up in the new creation, and there shall be no more sin, or death." We find no Scripture authority for such a sentiment, and we are sure there is none. Till it shall appear, we pronounce it a mere fancy, from whomsoever it emanated. "If ye live after the flesh" [your *animal* nature; or, as mere animals] "*ye shall die.*" Romans 8: 11. Again, "If the *Spirit* of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead *dwell* in you, He that raised up Christ

from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11. If that Spirit does not dwell in us, we have no assurance of being *quickened to life, after* we have "*been destroyed.*" Our life and immortality depends upon the Spirit of God dwelling in us, or there would be no reason for the apostle's "*if.*" "The wages of sin is death." Romans 6: 23. When that death takes place which is the wages of sin—or, *personal* transgression, let any one show, if they can, that the subject of it, who has "been destroyed," will ever "*be raised up in the new creation.*" In our opinion no such doctrine is found in the Bible. We hope we shall be able to get a clear idea of PROF. MAURICE'S belief, and that he may see, if he does not, that to men who follow their *animal* nature no other destiny is announced in Scripture than that of animals, *viz.* "*death*"—an irrevocable cessation of conscious being; they are "as natural brute beasts * * * and shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 1 Peter 2: 12.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

OR, REMARKS ON MATTHEW 25: 46.

BY THE EDITOR.

'These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

This text is supposed by many to sustain the theory of the immortality of the human soul, and the endless misery of the wicked.

It is said—"If the everlasting *misery* of the wicked may come to an end, so may the everlasting *bliss* of the righteous, as the self same word is employed to express the *duration* of the *misery* of the one class as the *happiness* of the other."

We answer—The text saith not a word of the "happiness" of the one nor of the "misery" of the other. But if it did, it would avail nothing to the advocate of the common theory, unless he could prove the two classes equally undying, and immortal.

The term *aionion*—translated *eternal* and *everlasting*, in this text—does not, of itself, prove either the righteous or wicked would have a perpetual and unending existence, because it does not necessarily mean *without end.* This can easily be shown by its use, and the use of its corresponding word—*oulom*—in Hebrew; which latter word occurs, in some of its forms, more than three hundred times in the Old Testament, and in a large majority of cases will be found to express a period, longer or shorter, that will have an end. Thus the Aaronical ministry is called an "*everlasting* priesthood:" the hills are called "everlasting hills."

Those who think, because the same term expressing duration is applied to both classes, in the text under consideration, it is made certain that the wicked will exist as long as the righteous, may be taught that they reason both inconclusively and dangerously. Take the following text, "The *everlasting* God." Isaiah 40: 25; and compare it with Heb. 3: 6, "The *everlasting* mountains." Shall the mountains continue as long as God? How will the advocates of unending misery evade the conclusion, on their premises, that the mountains will continue as long as God? Will they say, "We know the mountains will melt in the final conflagration?" True; and we know the wicked will be "burned up, and be left neither root nor branch," because, "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts:" Mal. 4: 1. But the Bible declares that God is "the King *immortal:*" not subject to be dissolved: while the everlasting mountains will be scattered and melted.

What is the argument, then, that the righteous are to continue in life while the wicked perish from life? It is not alone in the expression everlasting, or eternal, in the text; but in the fact that other texts assure us the righteous "put on immortality, incorruption," at the resurrection; 1 Cor. 15: and, saith Jesus, "Neither can they die any more:" Luke 20. Thus their perpetuity in life is settled by language that can have no other sense than that of unending life and being: while no such language occurs in relation to the wicked. On the contrary, they are to be "*consumed, devoured, burned up, be destroyed, utterly destroyed, soul* and body," &c. Such expressions, in the absence of any text affirming the immortality of wicked men, must settle the question, if testimony can settle any point.

The stumbling stone of our opposers is, in their assumption that protracted *pain* and *punishment* are necessarily identical. But this assumption is false in fact. What is the highest crime known in human law? It is murder. What is the punishment for that crime? Is it the most *protracted* pain? Or, is it the *deprivation of life?* It is the latter: and that is called the "*capital* punishment;" not because the criminal endures more pain, or as much as he might by some other; but because he is cut off from life.

If it be attempted to evade this point by saying—"The criminal feels horribly, while awaiting the day of execution,"—we ask, if his feelings are any part of the *penalty* of the law? Certainly not. They may be a *consequence* of his crime; but the law does not say he shall feel bad, but that *he shall die.* But, say the advocates of the common idea of *pain*, as essential to punishment, "there is the dreadful hereafter to the criminal." We reply, whatever may be hereafter to him, that is no part of the penalty of the law under which he dies. So the Judge understands it, who pronounces the death sentence; for he concludes by saying, "May God have mercy on your soul:" *i. e.*, "May

you not be hurt hereafter." Thus, turn which way our opposers may, they meet a two edged sword that hews in pieces their notion of protracted pain and punishment being necessarily identical.

In the text under consideration, the Saviour expresses the idea of punishment, without any necessary idea of protracted pain. The word here translated punishment is *kolasin:* and it is never used, on any other occasion, in any of our Lord's discourses, as recorded in the Bible. When he speaks of *torment*, as he often does in the Gospels and in Revelation, he most uniformly uses the word *basanois*, but never, *kolasin*. *kolasin* properly expresses punishment; and, strictly, the *kind* of punishment; as one meaning of the term is "*cut off*." The righteous enter into *life eternal:* the wicked are eternally *cut off* from life.

But we have an inspired Commentator on this declaration of our Lord; *viz.*, Paul, the apostle. Whatever *scene* is described Matt. 25, and whatever *time* is spoken of, the same, in both respects, Paul speaks of 2 Thess. 1. They are both laid in one scene. Compare them together. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him." Matt. 25: 31. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." 2 Thess. 1: 7. Is here any mistake? Is not the scene the same in both texts? Is it possible to separate them? Again, "These shall go away into everlasting punishment." Matt. 25: 46. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." 2 Thess. 1: 9.

Here is no room to doubt but what Paul is speaking of the same punishment as Jesus; and the apostle declares the punishment is "*destruction*," not *preservation* under any circumstances; and the apostle tells us this destruction is "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This last expression may have the sense of "out of his presence," but we are inclined to believe it a reference to the consuming fire that sometimes came out from the presence of the Lord, under the law given by Moses; as for example, in Lev. 10: 1, 2.—"Nadab and Abihu, sons of Aaron, took either of them his censor, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not: and there went out *fire from* the Lord, and *devoured* them, and they *died* before the Lord." Or, take the case of those who, in the rebellion of Korah (Numb. 16: 35,) had taken their censors to appear before the Lord, "And there came out a fire from the Lord, and *consumed* the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense." Here was no *preservation*, but a being *consumed, devoured;* so that they "*died.*" To this, most likely, Paul refers. The presence of Christ in his glory, with his holy angels, will so overpower and fill with terror the wicked, who behold him, that they will *die*—be *destroyed*—by the sight. If Daniel, Dan. 10th, and John, the beloved disciple, Rev. 1, both "fell *as dead*" at the sight of the glory manifested to them, and recovered not till a hand was laid on them, with a voice saying "*fear not*," how then shall Christ's *enemies* live when he shall appear in glory? They cannot: they have cultivated such a disregard for Christ, and contempt of him, in his absence, that when he appears in his glory his presence will fill them with such fear as to destroy them forever. No hand is to be laid on them, nor voice heard, to soothe their fears; and they are "*utterly consumed* with terror." Their punishment is "death—the wages of sin:" and it is irrevocable—it is eternal. Thus Paul gives us a sure interpretation of Jesus' words, and enables us to speak with certainty as to the kind of punishment that is to be the portion of wicked men.

How death, from which there is no recovery, can be an eternal punishment, we will further illustrate. The highest punishment known in the law of God or man is *loss of life*, or death. The deprivation of life may be attended with pain or it may not. If it is, it is not *the* punishment; it is merely an accident attending the punishment. This truth is self-evident to the reflecting mind; because, however much the murderer might suffer in *dying*, *that* would not meet the claim of the law, or answer its penalty, unless his life is extinguished: he must "be hung by the neck *until he is dead*," saith the law.

If this man, when dead, could be restored to life in one year after, with the right to live, his punishment would be of only *one* year's duration. If a thousand years after, then it would have been of a thousand years duration: not of *pain*, but of *loss of life*. If he is never to be restored, but to remain eternally dead, then *how long* is his punishment? Is it not *eternal*, in the strictest sense? It is an eternal deprivation of life. Such is the Bible teaching in relation to the punishment of wicked men. And if we would live eternally we must come to Christ for that life. God has given to us eternal life, but that life is in His Son, and not in ourselves: See 1 John 5: 11, 12. It is the life-giving Spirit of God, bestowed on those, and those *only*, who come to Christ for it. This is that Spirit which raised up Christ from the dead, and by which, only, can any man be quickened to *immortality* and *incorruptibility*: (Rom. 8: 11, with 1 Cor. 15: 45, 54:) without it men perish—are destroyed—die, and "*shall be no more.*" Psalms 104: 35. "Be as though they had not been;" Obadiah 16: "for the wages of sin is death;" Romans 6: 23; and, "all the wicked will God destroy;" Psalms 145: 20; yea, "They shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Psalms 37: 20.

From the Christian Advocate and Journal.

IS PARADISE HEAVEN?

"It has occurred to my mind, while reading the account of Christ's suffering, death, resurrection, and ascension, that paradise is not

heaven, but the place where the departed spirits of the righteous remain (and are perfectly happy) until the resurrection. Christ said to the thief while upon the cross, 'This day thou shalt be with me in paradise.' And to Mary, after his resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I have not yet ascended to my Father.' And when he ascended, we are informed by St. Luke, 'That he led' his disciples 'out as far as to Bethany, and lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into *heaven*.' It appears that Christ's spirit was not in heaven those three days his body was in the tomb, *but in paradise*. And Mr. Wesley says, paradise means 'the place where the souls of the righteous remain from death till the resurrection.'

Now I wish to know if paradise is heaven?

AN INQUIRER.

We believe the view of the above subject to which the 'Inquirer' has come is very generally sanctioned by the Christian Church.—ED. CH. ADVOCATE."

NOTE BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—If the above view is "sanctioned by the Christian Church," then it follows, that saints when they die do *not* go to be "*with Christ*;" for he has *left Paradise* and gone to *Heaven*. So the "Christian Church" is as far from getting dead saints to "the *golden hills*" as we are: only they keep them in a *half-way* house, *waiting* for the resurrection, and we let them "*sleep*" quietly, till that event.

FROM MRS. C—— W——.

Hancock Co., Ohio, Jan. 8th, 1854.

Mr. G. Storrs,—Dear Sir:—In looking over the columns of the "Tribune" I was led to notice "The Bible Examiner;" and was much surprised to find my own opinions therein expressed so truly; as I was not aware there was any person in the world held such views except myself. And had I not found philosophy, reason, and revelation to sustain me, I might have doubted my senses. Because others believe as we do, adds nothing to the truth—but it encourages us to believe it is not all a delusion if others see the same thing. I have long been convinced that eternal life was the *free* gift of God in Jesus Christ: and unless through faith we are made the recipients of his Spirit we have no living principle within us.

However, this is but one link in a chain of truths, which compose the history of redeeming love, from which, not one link can be severed without destroying the whole. The Gospel is a perfect system, devised by infinite wisdom, to restore lost man to the moral image of God; and it is as susceptible of demonstration upon the principles of moral philosophy as any system in nature. And it is much to be regretted that it should not be truly understood and more consistently preached.

It requires moral courage to avow a belief in opposition to long received opinions of men called *great* and good,—but in a matter of such unspeakable importance every one should think for themselves; and in this land of freedom every one has the right to say what they think, nevertheless I find there is almost an inquisition for thoughts. As I find you have embraced some important truths, I feel interested to learn your whole views with respect to man's salvation; and shall be much obliged if you will send me a pamphlet, or a number of the "semi-monthly;" and if I approve of it will become a subscriber—if not, will give you my reasons and compensate fully.

I fear you will think me intrusive, but in truth, sir, I feel conscientious about introducing any thing among my children and friends that is not calculated to make wise unto salvation. We have much already of no good, but of much evil, strewed in our paths as reading matter.

I feel much interested in your publication, and hope it is in every respect what it should be—a quickening, life-giving messenger to lost mankind.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The foregoing is the result of an advertisement of the Bible Examiner we put into the New York Tribune. It manifests such a spirit that we cannot forbear giving it a place in our paper, but have suppressed the name of the writer lest she might not approve our inserting it. It is truly encouraging to learn, as we have in several instances by our advertisements, that there are persons whose views harmonize with ours on the *Life theme*, who have been unaware how widely these views have spread in Europe and in the United States. If our sister differs from us, on any point, we shall be glad to receive any light she may have beyond us. We have not the vanity to suppose there is not more light from the word than any of us have yet received.

FROM LESTER F. SIKES.

West Springfield, Mass.

Br. Storrs:—In reading Math. 11th: 2 to 6, we are informed of the doings of Jesus, as he sent word back to John, who was then in prison. Among his doings he declares that "the dead are raised." Upon the modern theory, what advantage could be derived, only in establishing His power, and perhaps His mission? The ruler's daughter, or the widow's son, I can see in no other light, without it was to heal and comfort those that mourn. Suppose they both went to heaven, as the sects say; I must say that they were called back from all the joy and happiness

that modern fancy can devise. If, on the other hand, hell had been their portion, it was their gain to come back, if they made their election sure before they again departed this life; and I am certain they would not let slip so great salvation, if they had had experimental knowledge respecting that awful state. In John 11, we read of the death of Lazarus. It appears that the family of this person was a stopping place of our Saviour. The sisters sent word to Jesus that their brother was sick, hoping he would come and heal him. Although he loved Lazarus, yet he delayed till he died. He tells his disciples it was for their sakes he died, that they might believe. Before his arrival he is met by Martha, who says, "if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died." He had been dead four days. The sisters, with the other mourners, came and met Jesus; such were their feelings, that He also groaned and wept with them; and the remark was made, "how he loved him;" and after speaking of what Jesus had previously done, wanted to know, if even this man should have died, as he had healed so many. As they went to the grave, Martha said he had been dead so long that he had begun to decay; nevertheless, the glory of God was to be manifested; for they rolled away the stone from it, and, soon after, Jesus called Lazarus to come forth. He obeyed, and came forth in his grave clothes.

Now, to look at it in modern light, we see him who was beloved, gone to heaven four days previous, called back to the joy of his friends. What must have been his thoughts of the exchange? Well might Jesus have "wept" to call back, to undergo more of the troubles of mortality, one who had gone safely to heaven! How was the glory of God seen in this view? One whom he loved, to be tried and tempted, merely to stop a few mourning tears! In heaven all is safe; no fear of taking his life there. Yet Lazarus' life was sought, after being raised, by the Jews. Truly might Jesus weep, to think what Lazarus had got to suffer for the glory of God! To be sought after as a wild beast, that his life might be taken. These views, how revolting! Truly, I feel thankful I can see and believe, with the ancient, and the few modern believers, that Jesus is what he says, "I am the resurrection and the life." I hope that may be our portion—even eternal life.

From J. Wendell.

Edinboro, Penn. Jan'ry 18, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—The light of "life, only through Christ," is spreading in these parts, though not without opposition. The other evening I preached on the subject, and, after I closed, a Methodist minister arose and spoke in defence of their "traditions," and closed by saying, we made man like the beast. I remarked, in reply, that we did not make man like the beast, but God declares he is so; and then quoted Eccl. 3: 18, 20; Ps. 49: 20. Thus, while God declares man to be "like the beasts that perish," you correct the Almighty, and say, man is *like God*. Where is your authority? Where your proof from the Bible? I admit you have, in the Bible, one proof text for your position, and only one, viz.: Gen. 3: 4, 5. But I reject your witness; he stands impeached by all the other witnesses, as well as by direct testimony, that he is a liar from the beginning. The discussion lasted till near midnight. I then told him I should be happy to meet him at any time, and discuss the question, but he would not agree to meet me. It has created quite an interest, and I am invited in every direction to come and preach the word of life—all new places. I have been here but a few weeks, and the traveling has been bad—no sleighing nor wagoning; consequently, I have remained near home; but the prospect seems fair for doing good, by the blessing of God, which I pray may rest upon all our efforts. Amen.

The True Wesleyan says, "We did no wrong. We do not repent. We never refused an exchange (with the Bible Examiner) but thought The True Wesleyan went regularly until otherwise informed last week."

Thank you, Br. Wesleyan. Right glad you did not intend to slight us; and we cheerfully correct the insinuation of your sin and "repentance," contained in the Examiner. We thank you, also, for the very pretty "Juvenile Instructor" that now accompanies the Wesleyan. It is a neat quarto of four pages, published every other week, at 25 cents, or five copies for $1, by *Lucius C. Matlack*, at Syracuse, N. Y.

"The World's Crisis," is the name of a paper just started at Lowell, Mass., without price. Its object is to scatter the views of those who believe the Second Advent of Christ will occur *this year*. We have no confidence whatever in the grounds of their calculations in the matter; but we intend to have no strife about it: a few weeks will test the truth of their theory; and as most of those concerned are sincere and honest men, we trust they will be preserved from all excesses.

"The Second Advent Watchman," published at Hartford, Conn., and edited by Eld. Joseph Turner—who was with us in defence of the Bible last June, in the "Bible Convention"—is published weekly, at $2 per year. The paper is a neat quarto of eight pages. Though not agreeing with its Editor in all his theological views, we sincerely hope he may be sustained, and that the Watchman will not be permitted to go down by the desertion of those who have shared so liberally the use of its columns.

It has nobly maintained the views on Life and Death advocated in the Examiner. It is a free medium, also, on all the general views relating to the Second Advent of Christ. The *time* of that advent has been largely discussed in it the past few months; and many have been heard in defence of the view that it will occur in 1854. The Editor dissents from them, though he has said but little, compared with its advocates. We are sorry that they should think of *abandoning* the Watchman to start a *new* paper *exclusively* in their views. We hope they will rally to the support of the Watchman.

BRAIN AND THOUGHT.—Richmond mentions the case of a woman whose brain was exposed in consequence of the removal of a considerable portion of its bony covering by disease. He says he repeatedly made pressure on the brain, and each time suspended all feeling and all intellect, which were instantly restored when the pressure was withdrawn. The same writer also relates another case, that of a man who had been trepanned, and who perceived his intellectual faculties failing, and his existence drawing to a close, every time the efused blood collected upon the brain so as to prodnce pressure. Professor Chapman, of Philadelphia, mentions, in his Lectures, that he saw an individual with his skull perforated and the brain exposed, who was accustomed to submit himself to the same experiment of pressure as the above, and who was exhibited by the late Professor Westar to his class. His intellect and moral faculties disappeared on the application of pressure to the brain; they were held under the thumb, as it were, and restored at pleasure to their full activity by discontinuing the pressure. But the most extraordinary case of this kind within my knowledge, and one peculiarly interesting to the physiologist and metaphysician, is related by Sir Astley Cooper in his Surgical Lectures. A man, by the name of Jones, received an injury of his head while on board a vessel in the Mediterranean, which rendered him insensible. The vessel, soon after this, made Gibraltar, where Jones was placed in the hospital, and remained several months in the same insensible state. He was then carried on board the Dolphin frigate to Deptford, and from thence was sent to St. Thomas's Hospital, London. He lay constantly on his back, and breathed with difficulty. His pulse was regular, and each time it beat he moved his fingers. When hungry or thirsty he moved his lips and tongue. Mr. Clyne, the surgeon, found a portion of the skull depressed, trepanned him, and removed the depressed portion. Immediately after this operation the motion of the fingers ceased, and at four o'clock in the afternoon (the operation having been performed at one) he sat up in bed; sensation and volition returned, and in four days he got out of bed and conversed. The last thing he remembered was the circumstance of taking a prize in the Mediterranean. From the moment of the accident, *thirteen months and a few days*, oblivion had come over him, and all recollection ceased. He had, for more than one year, drunk of the cup of Lethe, and lived wholly unconscious of existence: yet, on removing a small portion of bone which pressed upon the brain, he was restored to the full possession of the powers of his mind and body.—*Dr. Brigham.*

—o—

REAPING LIFE AND CORRUPTION.—Gal. vi. 8: "He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption." The term *corruption*, in Greek and English, has two significations, moral depravity and putrefaction. In the present instance, the first of these meanings cannot be intended by the apostle, for it will offer no congruous sense to say, He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap *depravity*. The term, therefore, in this place, signifies *putrefaction*, as the concomitant of death: literal destruction. Thus the same word is used, Rom. viii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50; Col. ii. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 12. The whole verse will then present a forcible and intelligible statement. "He that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*."—*White's Life in Christ.*

—o—

IMMORTALITY AND DEATH.—Rom. ii. 6, 7: "God will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality, eternal life." Chap. vi. 23: "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." In these passages, *Immortality* and *Death* are declared to be the respective destinies of the righteous and the wicked; and it is apparently conveyed in the strongest possible manner, that "immortality" is the "gift of God" to the godly alone.—*Ibid.*

—o—

BIBLE VS. TRADITION.—This work is a thorough cure for the natural immortality theory; and shows beyond a reasonable doubt that Life and Immortality are the gift of God through Jesus Christ *alone*, and by the resurrection at the last day. *Price*, 75 cents. For $5, *ten* copies. Sent in all cases at the expense of the purchaser, except where $1 is sent for one copy, and the two double Examiners containing Ham's Works, then we pay the postage.

—o—

PREACHING IN NEW YORK, every Sunday, at *Mechanic's Hall*, 472 Broadway, above Grand St., by H. L. Hastings, Editor of the Examiner, and occasionally by others. The *Life Theme* is made *prominent* in this meeting. Friends in the city, and from the country, visiting the city, are invited to meet with us. *Seats free.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1854. NO. 4.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS.--One Dollar for the Year;

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"UNITY OF MAN."

OR, REVIEW OF REV. LUTHER LEE.

BY ANTHROPAS.

[Never before published in the Examiner.]

In Mr. Lee's article No. 12, he bases an argument on the doctrine of what he is pleased to call "the primitive church" or the "Apostolic Fathers." He says—"In an investigation like the one in which we are engaged, it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them."

As a preliminary question, I would ask, What do we understand by "*the primitive church?*" and "the early Christians?" I understand what Mr. Lee means, but, I apprehend, he is utterly wrong in his hypothesis. "The primitive church," in point of fact, was the first church established by the Apostles; and this will carry us back to Jerusalem, the locality of the first Christian Congregation. "The early Christians" are those who first received the Gospel of Christ, and obeyed it. And, in this view of the subject, I grant that "it is of the *utmost importance* to understand what their doctrine was; but I do not suppose it possible to determine this point by an appeal to those who have been termed "Apostolic Fathers." But, why appeal to these "Fathers" at all? Mr. Lee's doctrine was either taught by the Apostles, or it was not; if it was, surely he can make it appear from their writings; but, if it was not taught, why appeal to the Fathers to prove that which is *false?*

That must be a bad cause which requires such testimony to sustain it, in the absence of all scriptural evidence!

But in reference to these Fathers, I will remark, that their writings are not to be relied upon. The five Fathers who flourished in the first century, were Barnabas, Hermas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp.

The first of these quoted by Mr. Lee is St. Clement. This Clement, if I mistake not, is claimed as one of the *Popes* of Rome, by Catholic authority. They place *Peter* in the chair first, then *Linus*, who transferred it to *Anacletus*, then CLEMENT. EUSEBIUS, book iii, chap. 2, page 82; chap. 13, page 100.

Speaking of the writings of Clement, Du Pin, who is regarded as an authentic Roman Catholic historian, proves them to be spurious; because, first, "The second epistle of St Clement directed to St. James, speaks of the *Ostiarii* or door-keepers, arch-deacons, and other ecclesiastical officers, *that were not then introduced into the church;*" 2d, "This letter mentions *sub*-deacons, an order not then established in the church." p. 584.

But, in relation to all, or most, of these writings of the Apostolic Fathers, I will again refer to Du Pin. "Criticism is a kind of torch, that lights and conducts us, in the obscure tracts of antiquity, by making us able to distinguish *truth* from *falsehood*, *history* from *fable*, and *antiquity* from novelty. 'T is by this means, that in our times we have disengaged ourselves from an infinite number of very common errors into which our fathers fell for want of examining things by the rules of true criticism. *For it is a surprising thing to consider how many* SPURIOUS BOOKS *we find in antiquity; nay, even* IN THE FIRST AGES OF THE CHURCH." He then proceeds to give the reasons which prompted persons thus to publish "Spurious Books," the first of which is, "the malice of heretics; who, to give the greater reputation to their heresies, composed several books, which they attributed to persons of great reputation." &c. "And thus the first heretics devised *false Gospels, false Acts, and false Epistles of the Apostles, and their Disciples*," &c.

Mr. Hinton says of these Fathers, that "There are no writings of these venerable men that can be safely relied on as the productions of their pens, except perhaps, the epistle of Clement; and the reader has seen the disposition we make of his writings. Furthermore, he says—"Indeed, such was the state both of literature and morals, in the fourth and subsequent centuries, that the favorite occupation of the Monks of those days, seems to have been first to write the most ridiculous nonsense by way of indicating their literary taste; and then fraudulently to attach to it the name of some eminent Father of the first or second century, by way of proving the high state of their moral sensibility."

Mosheim says—"The epistle of Barnabas was the production of some Jew," &c. "The 'Shepherd of Hermas,' was composed in the second century by Hermes, who was brother of Pius, bishop of Rome."

But, after all, it seems to me that Mr. Lee has

rather *forced* Polycarp to testify in favor of his hypothesis, than otherwise, and that the quotation made does not *legitimately* prove it. But, be this as it may, there is little or no reliance to be placed on any of these reputed Epistles, as we have already seen.

But, I would have the reader remember, that even in the Apostles' day, the "mystery of iniquity" began to work, and to develope itself. Many errors, and among them, I apprehend, that advocated by Mr. Lee himself, were quite prevalent; even in the Apostolic Age. Of this class were Hymeneus and Philetus, who, by advocating the opinion now taught by Mr. Lee, Mr. Brewster, Dr. Bush and others, denied the proper resurrection of the body, and "overthrew the faith of some." If a man puts on his "resurrection body" when he dies, then the resurrection of the body at the coming of Christ is a nullity and a fable! This view obtained before the death of the Apostles; no marvel, therefore, that we should find traces of it in the first and second centuries, and down to the present time.

What doctrine, I ask, has not been proved by the testimony of the Fathers? Mr. Lee goes to them to prove the "immateriality" (*the nothingness*) of the soul: the Pædobaptist to prove Infant sprinkling; the Baptist to prove immersion; the Catholic to prove that Peter was the first Pope, the truth of the doctrine of Purgatory, the invocation of saints, Apostolic succession, &c., &c. Mr. Lee says—"It is of the utmost importance to understand what was the doctrine of the early Christians, who received their instructions from the Apostles, and those who immediately succeeded them." Let *him*, then, be *honest* to them, and to himself, and believe *all* they taught! But, I apprehend, he would not be willing to endorse the sentiments of even all the extracts he has made! And I am sure that their testimony is not necessary, except to sustain a *rotten* cause!

But, in order to rebut all the *remaining* force of Mr. Lee's argument, I will introduce a passage from *Justin Martyr*, who was born A. D. 89, and suffered death for Christ A. D. 163. He tells Trypho, the Jew, "that some indeed called Christians, are in fact atheists (*atheai*—without God) and impious heretics, because in every way, they teach blasphemy, impiety and folly." He gives proof of his own sincerity, and protests that he was "determined to follow no men, nor human authority, but God and the doctrine taught by him;" adding "should you happen upon some who are called Christians indeed, and yet are far from holding these sentiments, but even *dare* to assail the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob with blasphemy and say, *'there is no resurrection of the dead; but instantly when they die, are received up into heaven, do not count these among Christians*, even as they are not Jews, if accurately considered, who are called Sadducees, and the like sects of Genistar, Meristar, Galileans, *Hellinists, Pharisees*, Baptists, (a sect that followed John the Baptist) and others: but under the name of Jews and sons of Abraham, they worship God, as he accuses them, with their lips only, while their heart is far from him. But I, and all who are sound in the Christian faith, are acquainted with the resurrection of the body, and the 1000 years in Jerusalem, that shall be rebuilt, adorned, and enlarged, as the Prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare." Brooks on Prophecy, page 52; also Duffield's work. Justin Martyr himself affirms that he was contemporary with the Apostle John, who wrote the Revelation, in which mention is made of the 1000 years five times, in connexion with the universal subjugation of evil, the resurrection from the dust of the sleeping saints, and their reign with Christ.

Here, then, we have a clear and distinct expression of sentiment, in relation to this point; while Mr. Lee has to *infer* from the language he quotes, that such was the view of the authors he cites. Justin Martyr distinctly tells Trypho, that he was not to "count those as Christians" who believed the, *now*, popular doctrine! Mr. Brooks says—"Irenæus ranks these professors, in his work against Heresies (book v.) as among the heretical; and the testimony of the church is uniform on this point (if we except some questionable passages in Cyprian) down into Popish times; and, indeed, it was the general opinion of the Greek and Latin churches down to the Council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV., A. D. 1439."

Bishop Taylor, in his work on the 'Liberty of Prophesying' (viii.) sets this in a clear light. He says—"It is a plain recession from antiquity which was determined by the council of Florence—*That the souls of the pious, being purified, are immediately received into heaven and behold clearly the Triune Jehovah just as he is;* for those who please to try, may see it resolved dogmatically to the contrary by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Arethas Cæsariensis, and Euthymius, who may answer for the Greek church. And it it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek church by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine Council, where the Latins acted their master piece of wit and stratagem—the greatest that hath been till the famous Council of Trent. And for the Latin church, Tertullian, Ambrose, Austin, Hilary, Prudentius, Lactantius, Victorinus, and Bernard, are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atriis*—in unseen receptacles and outer darkness—where they expect the resurrection," &c.

The early Reformers maintained the *primitive* faith on this point, plainly perceiving *that the object of the Papists was to help forward the doctrine of purgatory and invocation of saints.* Thus *Tyndal*, disputing with the Papists, says, "*If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then, what cause of the resurrection?*"

And, again, in reply to Sir Thomas More, who

objects against *Luther*—
couraged the sinner to co
so long postponed the ult
dal says, "*Christ* and h
other, but warned to loo
again every hour; which
*ye believe it will never
feigned that* other mer
stantaneous translation
death!

Calvin also, in his *P*
thus to another objection
"I answer, that Christ i
dom and glory have not
members were to go (t
head (comes) the order
verted and preposterous.
our Prince then, when
glory of his Father, and
his majesty, p. 255 .It
ed, that the Protestant
should have fallen into t
on this subject (abatin
edgment of Purgatory
of which has done mor
perhaps, toward withdr
the lively expectation
This doctrine of the nat
soul, being pagan in its
with Christianity, and
work of the Apostacy.
doctrine of Purgatory,
When *Martin Luther*
sade against "the Moth
inations of the earth,"
trine in question, as a p
sion of the wicked One.

D'Aubigne says—"D
who would neither conn
nor with Wittemberg.
the 15th October, 152
Elector's brother, to i
those who opposed the
tion. 'Some,' wrote he
of the soul, and these F
of St. Anthony through
them into the gutter
Luther's teaching.'"

The following is ar
Life of Luther, which
rejected the pagan dog
in the animal Man.
bad principle of every
ture to suit himself, an
illustrative of its evil t
says he, was first intro
Thus he writes:—'The
came to announce, that
irresistible argument a
tory, and Prayer to
simply to deny the Imm
idea that had been h
some Italian refugees
laughed at. They left
Geneva, where we find
in a crowded school, an
all which has been said

objects against *Luther*—that his doctrine encouraged the sinner to continue in sin, seeing it so long postponed the ultimate judgment, *Tyndal* says, "*Christ* and his *apostles* taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's coming again every hour; which coming again, *because ye believe it will never be*, therefore have ye *feigned that* other merchandise"—of the instantaneous translation of souls to heaven at death!

Calvin also, in his *Psycopannuchia*, replies thus to another objection against this doctrine:—"I answer, that Christ is our head, whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared. If the members were to go (to heaven) before their head (comes) the order of things would be inverted and preposterous. But we shall follow our Prince then, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit upon the throne of his majesty, p. 255 .It is greatly to be lamented, that the Protestant Church of a latter period should have fallen into the errors of the Papists on this subject (abating the distinct acknowledgment of Purgatory)—errors, the adoption of which has done more than any other thing, perhaps, toward withdrawing from the church the lively expectation of Christ's Advent." This doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, being pagan in its origin, was incorporated with Christianity, and constituted the grand work of the Apostacy. Upon it was built the doctrine of Purgatory, invocation of saints, &c. When *Martin Luther* first commenced his crusade against "the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the earth," he repudiated the doctrine in question, as a part of the strong delusion of the wicked One.

D'Aubigne says—"Duke George of Saxony, who would neither connect himself with Rome nor with Wittemberg. had written, as early as the 15th October, 1521, to Duke John the Elector's brother, to induce him to side with those who opposed the progress of the Reformation. 'Some,' wrote he, 'deny the immortality of the soul, and these Friars too, drag the Relics of St. Anthony through the streets, and through them into the gutters. All this comes of Luther's teaching.'"

The following is an extract from Audlin's Life of Luther, which will prove that Luther rejected the pagan dogma of an immortal soul in the animal Man. "He is speaking of the bad principle of every one construing Scripture to suit himself, and adduces the Italians as illustrative of its evil tendency, which practice, says he, was first introduced by Martin Luther. Thus he writes:—'These were new lights, who came to announce, that they had discovered an irresistible argument against the Mass, Purgatory, and Prayer to the saints. This was simply to deny the Immortality of the soul, an idea that had been hatched in the brains of some Italian refugees, who were publicly laughed at. They left Wittemberg and went to Geneva, where we find them in 1561, sustaining in a crowded school, and in printed *theses*, that all which has been said about the Immortality of the soul was invented by Antichrist for the purpose of making the Pope's pot boil. *Purgatorium cum missa et pontifice romano melius abolere possumus, quam si dicamus simul anima cum corpore extingui. Quidquid animarum habetur immortalitate, ab Antichristo ad statuendam suam culinam excogitatum est.* This proposition was really maintained in Geneva, not however in General Assembly as Prateolus relates in Elench. voce. p. 72, but by some Italian exiles, who published their *theses*, and maintained them in full school.'—*Boyle, Art. Luther.*

"They quoted Luther, who had said, 'It is idle to trouble ourselves with endeavoring to prove that the soul is produced by propagation, or that it is infused into the body at the moment of creation. I maintain with the poet, *that the child follows its parent. Op. Luther, t.* xi; *Boyle, Art. Luther.* They misunderstood the passage." *Audlin, pp.* 192, 193.

The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, is the foundation on which the Harlot Mother sits; and, as she is the mother of harlots, all her daughters have drank deeply of her spiritual fornication! The whole Protestant world is tinctured with this subtile heresy; and in vain do they oppose the Mass, Purgatory, and the invocation of saints, whose very existence depends upon the popular dogma of immortality, while they maintain, uphold and defend this foundation! If the popular doctrine be true, what argument can you bring against Purgatory? What against the invocation of saints? None, so effective as the one we oppose to those false and delusive dogmas.

Men, Brethren and Fathers! be *Protestants* indeed, and renounce every relic—the last vestige of Catholicism, or cease to call yourselves such! We are now grappling with the great City of Pago-papal Babylon; come, and with us lay hold of the mighty lever of truth, that the superstructure may fall, and, like a millstone cast into the deep, be found no more at all!

THE CROSS—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

[*Concluded from page* 31.]

That "the parable of the wicked husbandmen," and other passages, fully show that "the crucifixion" of our blessed Redeemer "was the highest expression of human wickedness," is no subject of our present controversy. It is to the inference deduced, by our respected author, from this obvious truth that I demur. The inference is, that it could not have been "for any purpose connected with his (God's) own righteous government," &c. We may as well infer from the fact of Joseph's brethren delivering "with wicked hands" their brother to the Ishmaelites to go down to Egypt, that God did *not* send him there "to preserve a posterity in the earth and to save (their) lives by

a great deliverance." Gen. 45: 7. So fully is the divine purpose recognized in the affair, that it was affirmed by Joseph to his brethren (to be understood of course in a qualified sense) "So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God." verse 8. It is a glorious truth, both rational and spiritual, that the Ruler of the Universe causes "the wrath of man to praise him." What man does for evil, God overrules for good. The word, which we declare to be "the only rule of faith," as positively declares the crucifixion of the Lord of glory to have been according "to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," as that it was done "with wicked hands." Acts 2: 23; 4: 27, 28. Their voluntary wickedness was indeed, as Mr. Ham observes, "the proximate cause" of the atrocious act. The purpose of God was the *remote* cause, operating in some manner, inscrutable to finite minds, in perfect harmony with the moral agency of men. "The stern logic of common sense" must admit, that the ways of an infinite being may, in some respects, be "past finding out" by finite minds.

Mr. H. argues, "that as Satan was the prime instigator of that deed (the death of the Lord Jesus) Satan must have given the satisfaction," *i. e.* "for sins."

For the phrase "satisfaction for sins," being unscriptural, I do not contend. The argument however is, that Satan must have done the good which the death of Christ did. If so, it follows that as Satan instigated Joseph's brethren to sell him to go into Egypt, Satan must have the credit of saving many "lives by a great deliverance!" Satan indeed did, in both cases, instigate that to be done which was *the occasion* of great good by God's overruling wisdom. But as he meant that for evil which God meant for good, he is justly condemned; and to God belongs the glory. A murderer may aim the fatal ball at my head, it may pass me and enter that of a wild beast, who is ready to tear me to pieces and thus save my life. This alters not the murderer's guilt. It does, however, according to Mr. D'Israeli's logic.

Again, it is argued that if "the justice of God was maintained and magnified by the death of the Lord Jesus Christ, then it follows, from the New Testament representations of the causes of Christ's death, that God's justice was maintained and magnified by the highest injustice and wickedness of men." The truth that Jehovah thus causes the wrath of man to praise him is established and illustrated by various scriptural facts. The history of Joseph, already considered, presents one of these facts. The justice of God was maintained and magnified by the wickedness of the King of Assyria, who was the sword of the Lord's anger against Israel for their sins. It was not in the heart of the proud monarch to fulfil the divine purpose; his object was the gratification of his own selfish ambition, he was therefore justly punished. Isaiah 10: 12. Wicked men are God's sword. The Philistines, &c., were such. Modern wars are exhibitions of the same. Wicked nations are the executioners of God's righteous judgments against other wicked nations; "for God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will." Rev. 17: 17.

It is also inferred from the supposition that the death of Christ is "the reason why God forgives sin," that "the world's guilt was purified by the foulest guilt the world ever perpetrated," &c. The abstract contemplation of this atrocious act, independently of other aspects, in which the Spirit of truth has taught us to view it, may indeed excite the exclamation, "Marvellous conclusions!" We shall however demand of "the stern logic of common sense" that it shall suspend its decisions until *all* the divine testimonies relative to the subject are considered. By quotations from these testimonies I have shown that "whatsoever" "wicked hands" did in this case was what God's "counsel determined a fore to be done," "to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins," &c. Acts 2: 23; 4: 27, 28; Romans 3: 25, 26; &c., &c. "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed," &c. Isaiah 53d chapter. "Marvellous conclusions" indeed of divine wisdom and love, which "the angels desire to look into," transcending probably, in some respects, their perceptive powers as they do ours.

In connection with the atrocity of the Jews, we must consider the fact of the voluntary sacrifice of the Son of God who "died for our sins;" ("I lay down my life of myself," said the friend of sinners. "I lay down my life for my sheep,") as well as the fact above stated that, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him" and to "make his soul (life) an offering for sin." What, I ask, has "the stern logic of common sense" to object against the principle, that a being of infinite perfections should overrule evil for good, the greatest evil for the greatest good?

I would ask the intelligent writer, in view of what I have stated above, whether the representation, that "it follows" from the doctrine of vicarious suffering, "that the greatest sin which was ever committed is the reasonable cause why God should forgive all other sins," is not too limited and partial? Must not the voluntary offering of the matchless Son of God, who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person, be involved in "the reasonable cause" of God's forgiving the sins of the penitent believer? That there is something pertaining to this wondrous transaction which transcends human reason is freely admitted.

How our respected author can maintain his views consistently with his avowed determination "to appeal first and last to the law and the testimony for the rule of our faith," I cannot possibly conceive.

It is remarked that "men must and will reason." Certainly. But what has reason to offer in objection to the proposition that a being of infinite wisdom can overrule evil for good? What has reason to show that the voluntary offering of the Son of God, may not so "mag-

nify" and make "honoral
that he may now "be jus
him which believeth in J
ever, that the subject tran
human reason, I affirm t
able and scriptural to adm
of the infinite Jehovah sh
be "unsearchable" and "
candid and talented writ
"it is both wise and
notes." He will admit,
the popular views of the
or reconciliation, to be wr
own views to be altogeth
absurb, and palpably fa
that our blessed Lord suf
of the law for sinners;
eternal death of all who
the Saviour does not die
sinner. This, however,
death was in *no sense* vic
not die "*for us* according

The prayer of the Sa
them," is indeed incompa
tion, that he has given en
sense of paying the Fa
This, however, does not
was, *in no sense*, a judici
it was *not* necessary tha
and the justifier of hi
Jesus." The divine wisd
sacrifice was needed, th
"righteousness, and peac
other in the wondrous pl
may be supposed that fo
of the subject, cannot b
part of the Father. I
Scripture or reason requ
in the case, as shall s
"God for Christ's sak
Eph. 4: 32. "God is L
source, we must trace th
redemption from sin and
to means and end. Yet
and his Father," in this g
author represents, perfe
theory which seems to in
sion is—all on Christ's si
absurdity that there is a
more merciful than "th
The scriptural truth that
righteousness" as well as
giveness of sin, implies
congruity.

"Now unto Him who
truth and love, and "to
fore the presence of his
joy; to the only wise Go
and majesty, dominion
and ever. Amen.

BOUND VOLUMES OF
had for '50 and '51; also
two years in one volume:

EXPOSITOR OF LIFE
(Scotland), for February,

nify" and make "honorable" his violated law, that he may now "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus?" Admit however, that the subject transcends the compass of human reason, I affirm that it is both reasonable and scriptural to admit also, that the ways of the infinite Jehovah should, in some respects, be "unsearchable" and "past finding out." The candid and talented writer well remarks, that "it is both wise and Christian to compare notes." He will admit, that proving some of the popular views of the doctrine of atonement, or reconciliation, to be wrong, is not proving his own views to be altogether *right*. It is indeed absurb, and palpably false in fact, to suppose that our blessed Lord suffered the entire penalty of the law for sinners; for this penalty is the *eternal* death of all who have sinned; whereas the Saviour does not die eternally even for one sinner. This, however, is no proof that his death was in *no sense* vicarious, or that he did *not* die "*for us* according to the Scriptures."

The prayer of the Saviour, "Father, forgive them," is indeed incompatible with the supposition, that he has given entire satisfaction, *in the sense of paying the Father our whole debt.* This, however, does not prove that his death was, *in no sense*, a judicial transaction; or that it was *not* necessary that God "might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." The divine wisdom has seen that this sacrifice was needed, that "mercy and truth," "righteousness, and peace" may embrace each other in the wondrous plan of our salvation. It may be supposed that forgiveness, in this view of the subject, cannot be entirely *free* on the part of the Father. I reply, that neither Scripture or reason require any such freedom in the case, as shall subvert the truth that "God for Christ's sake hath forgiven" us. Eph. 4: 32. "God is Love." To this infinite source, we must trace the entire system of our redemption from sin and death, both in respect to means and end. Yet "the oneness of Christ and his Father," in this glorious work, is, as our author represents, perfect. There is indeed a theory which seems to imply that "the compassion is—all on Christ's side." This involves the absurdity that there is a being in the universe more merciful than "the Father of Mercies." The scriptural truth that God will "declare his righteousness" as well as his *mercy* in the forgiveness of sin, implies no such degrading incongruity.

"Now unto Him who is able to" unite us in truth and love, and "to present us faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Saviour be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever. Amen.

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE EXAMINER can be had for '50 and '51; also, for '52 and '53: the two years in one volume: price $1.50 per vol.

EXPOSITOR OF LIFE AND IMMORTALITY (Scotland), for February, just received.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE FACTS AND PHENOMENA OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

[*Continued from page* 20.]

THE incidents of the closing scenes of our Lord's life, as they present themselves to our mind, abundantly confirm the views we have already expressed of the causes and characteristics of his death on the cross. Guided by the light of Christ's own teaching, and the manner in which he was wont to speak of his own death, we have read the historic facts of the crucifixion from a new standing point, and have obtained altogether new and more intelligible impressions as to the real moral significance of that stupendous event. To investigate the manner in which Christ alluded to his death, and the moral aspect in which he was accustomed to place it, may, to some of our readers, be a new direction of inquiry; but the reasonableness of such a course will at once commend itself; for who ought to be supposed to know best the nature and objects of the crucifixion, than the Crucified One himself? It seemed to us when first examining this subject, that the best expounder of the doctrine of the Cross would be Christ himself, and we took for certain, that an event of so much magnitude in his own personal history, would not fail to be fully expounded by him. Our anxiety to know the truth of this matter, and determination, by God's help, to pursue it, were favorable to a successful inquiry. We had studied, to some extent, the history of doctrinal development in the Churches, from the earliest ages down to the present time; and that study did much towards setting us free from our earlier confidence in the necessary perfectibility of popular and so called "evangelical" opinions. We had seen the various misapplication and abuse of the holy term "evangelical"—how it had been made to patronize the most conflicting and, ultimately, exploded opinions—and that, like a throne or national diadem—it had been seized upon and worn by one usurper after another—the strongest party, for the time being, claiming it exclusively as their own. The assumption of the title "evangelical," by one party of religionists, is akin to that impertinent conceit in the commercial world which claims to be the sole manufacturer and vender of a certain article of trade; and when the assumption is allowed, what is it but a popular patent, or charter of monopoly, which *may* have been granted by popular imbecility and ignorance, as well as by popular intelligence. The "traditions of the elders," in the course of our inquiry, relaxed their ancient hold upon our conscience and confidence, and set us free to sit at the feet of the great Teacher. Before this revolution in our mental experience, we never thought of asking the Lord Jesus Christ the meaning of his last sufferings and death; we thought we understood this and all other first principles of the Christian faith. But when we did ask this question, we got but one unvarying answer from

his lips. His crucifixion, he tells us, was an act of highest impiety and cruel wrong;—a manifestation of godless hostility to the holy laws and purposes of the Most High; and meriting the severest marks of the Divine displeasure. He says no more. His parable of the wicked husbandmen explains the causes, and describes the real character of this awful event. It was no display of God's righteousness, but of man's unrighteousness: it did not set forth the rectitude of the Divine law and government, but was a more emphatic rejection of that law and rebellion against that government. Hence the enquiry, "What, therefore, shall the lord of the vineyard do unto those husbandmen?" and the just and natural reply, "He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard to other husbandmen, who shall render him the fruits in their seasons." And this description we have found to accord with the several incidents of the crucifixion. All the facts and phenomena of our Lord's last sufferings and death, support, and only support, the view which he gives of the moral turpitude of that event. He ever described it as a wrong; and when he suffered, he suffered as one consciously enduring a wrong. He stated of the active agents in his death, that they were impelled by wicked—even Satanic influences; and when they execute their foul deed, he prays for them as men needing pardon for their great sin. He betrayed no consciousness of any interruption of filial intercourse with his Father: he never acted or spoke as one who was sensible that he was enduring the Divine wrath; his whole demeanor is at the farthest possible remove from any such conviction as that he was sustaining a part in a great *judicial* tragedy, and especially that part which is commonly assigned him. The candid inquirer must, we think, be struck with such phenomena as the historic incidents of the cross develop: he cannot but marvel, that the theory of the common theology is so entirely discrepant with the actual facts of the case. We do not think that we have unduly treated those facts, nor in the least distorted their natural and obvious significance. To us it seems reasonable that *the alleged theory should be borne out by the historic facts*, and if not so borne out, that the *theory*, and not the facts, should be discarded. On this reasonable principle we have acted, and by it we feel bound to abide.

The last illustration of this part of our argument, which we would introduce to the notice of our readers, will, we think, add additional weight to those which have preceded. It is furnished in the dying words of our Lord, when he said, "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," and bowed his head and expired.

How natural is this language in the lips of the dying Christ, on the supposition that he was conscious, at this time, of no other than an endeared filial relationship towards his Divine Father; and how *un*natural, on the supposition that he was conscious of being in the attitude of an imputed criminal, expiating a world's offences by suffering the penalty due to those offences. We lay great stress on the oft repeated statement, that we cannot discover in the phenomena of the crucifixion any evidence of that peculiar consciousness which Christ must have had, and must have expressed, had he been enduring the weight of God's judicial wrath against sin. The dying Jesus expresses the consciousness of a different experience. His is not the attitude of one "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;"—and we "esteem" him wrongly when we so interpret the cause of his grief; on the contrary, it is the attitude of one who was "despised and rejected of men,"—whom he came to serve and to save, and whose ingratitude and impiety pierced his loving heart. Surely, this act of self-commendation to his Father betrays no consciousness of that vast distance between himself and his Father, which, for the time being, at least, would have been possessed, had he been, in the eyes of the Holy One, but as the incarnation of a world's guilt. Here is no standing far off from God, as the Avenger of sin, but a drawing nigh to him, in filial confidence, as a Son to a Father. The Lord Jesus, at this time, was only conscious of a *Father's* presence, and a *Father's* sympathy; hence he addresses him as "Father," and commends himself to his care. "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

We can scarcely imagine any more unsuitable language for the holy Sufferer to employ, than that of *a personal commendation of himself to God as a Father*, on the supposition that he was the substitute for a criminal world at that time, and that then was the hour of his judicial execution. This language is highly inconsistent with the alleged circumstances;—another class of emotions, and other speech than such as indicate a filial and confiding consciousness, would certainly have more accorded with the supposed circumstances. So far from addressing God as a *Father*, we should have expected language from the dying One which recognized, pre-eminently and exclusively, the *Rectoral* and *Judicial* character of God; and instead of *commending himself*, in death, to the care of God, as his Almighty Parent, language betokening a sense of the most distressing rejection by God, as the Punisher of sin, would have been more suitable to the tragic scene. It should be borne in mind, that the popular theology recognizes in Christ on the cross, *an imputed criminal*, and affirms that such was his personal consciousness, and the light in which he was regarded by God. Is it not then, highly proper that we should confront this theory with the actual incidents of the crucifixion, and expect an agreement between those historic incidents and their theological explanation? Is it not natural that we should express surprise, that One sustaining the part of a Substitute for criminals, and therefore a criminal by imputation, should be found *commending himself*, in his dying moments, to the Sovereign whom, by his substitutionary attitude, he is supposed to have wronged?

If, instead of the substitute, the sinners themselves should suffer the wrath, which, it is said, God is morally obliged to inflict on the violators

of his law, can we imagine any language more unsuitable and offensive to the Majesty of God, than that which expressed the personal commendation of a world of sinners to Him? Christ is said to have endured what, in the sinners' experience, would have been the terrible hell punishment; if, then, the *Substitute* could "commend" himself to God, so, too, it would appear, might the *sinners* themselves, whom he was then representing. But conceive the offensive idea of sinners in hell *commending* themselves to God, in the language of confiding self-complacency!

It is not the wont of a criminal, in the act of dying under capital punishment, to "*commend*" himself to the state or society he has wronged. Such commendation would be loathed as most execrable, and regarded as an additional offence to the state. The consciousness suitable to such a season, is that of painful repudiation; but Christ exhibits *no such consciousness* in the hour of his death; his is the consciousness of a calm and consoling communion; his, the sense of the recovered presence of his heavenly Father —of which, in a brief, dark season of despondency, he had felt himself bereft. The dying Christ fell asleep in the bosom of a Father—not under the judicial wrath of an Omnipotent Executioner. His was the death of the beloved Son of God, not of the bruised and broken substitute for sinners. Throughout, his was the intercourse of a Son with a Father. We discover nothing of fear and trembling, of groaning under a sense of oppressive wrath, but filial tenderness and Divine affection, and solacing heart-communion with his Father in heaven. Such, too, was the impression received by the actual spectators of the crucifixion. "Truly," said one, "this was a *righteous* man!" "Truly," exclaimed others, "this was the *Son* of God!"

The traditions of the historic Church have preserved another theory of the death of Christ, than that which Christ and the facts and phenomena of the crucifixion give. They have distilled, out of this dark human depravity, a doctrinal significance of a most opposite character. This ostensible vice, according to the dominant theology, is the casket of purest virtue. From the dense blackness of human guilt, a light is conceived to break forth, which envelopes the throne of God in a halo of brightest holiness. This guilt of man is thus made to involve God's greatest glory. Such offence to the understanding and moral sense of mankind, is perpetrated by the traditionary theology of the dominant Churches.

Christ, however, dissipates this darkness, by a purer doctrine. No such amalgam of offensive absurdities can be found in his teaching. The crucifixion was, in his judgment, a crime against truth and justice, followed by a merited curse on its guilty perpetrators—the curse of a national blasting, and world-wide banishment. These shreds of savage sinfulness are never woven, by *his* hands, into a robe of righteousness, to conceal the guilty nakedness of human character, and render our race more estimable in God's sight—they demonstrated, on the contrary, the deep depravity of the human heart, and the wonderful lengths to which human wickedness can go. And with this teaching agree the *historic incidents* of the crucifixion. The phenomena of this tragic sequel of the Saviour's life verify the judgment which his own lips had passed on it. We see the great Sufferer succoured by his sympathizing Father; praying for the pardon of his murderers; astonished at his sense of desertion by God, and, finally, commending himself to that Father, who, from first to last, sustained no other than a Parental attitude towards the Son in whom he was well pleased. Nothing is expressed by Christ on the cross, which indicates his consciousness of being a substitute for a guilty world; expiating its sins by the endurance of its judicial deserts. Throughout, we discover only the consciousness of the holy Son of God—bearing, meekly, the wrath and rejection of men, to exemplify the perfection of an obedience unto death. It has remained for a scholastic theology to discover a theory of judicial expiation in the Cross of Christ—a theory which transforms wrong into right—human wickedness, into a manifestation of Divine rectitude; and which asserts the possibility of what the prophet so confidently challenges, when he asks, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"

[*To be Continued.*]

GOOD ADVICE.—Dr. Taylor, Norwich, England, at the close of one of his works says:—

"If in perusing this book you have discovered any truth you did not before understand, it is my earnest request, you would rather lay it up in your heart for your own use, than make it the subject of contention and strife, the fuel of party zeal, or the occasion of despising or censuring those who do not yet see it. And if you would enter into discourse about it, let it be with all moderation and coolness on your part; in the spirit of peace and mutual forbearance. Therefore never converse upon this, or any other point, with an *angry* man. Passion and heat blind the judgment: nor with a *Bigot*, who is determined for a scheme, and resolved to open his eyes to no further evidence. Whenever *anger* and *bigotry* appear in a conversation already begun, break it off; for, you cannot proceed to any good purpose, and will be in danger of catching a spirit which is quite contrary to the Gospel. *Hold the Truth in Love.* Fear God, and keep his commandments—despise [set light by] earthly things—restrain and regulate your passions—be constant in reading the Scriptures; fervent in prayer to God; kind and compassionate to all men; punctual and cheerful in every duty; humble in all your deportment; upright and honest in all your dealings; temperate and sober in all your enjoyments; patient under all afflictions; zealous in every good work; then with joy look for the coming of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, for he will assuredly appear to your everlasting salvation."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1854.

ETERNAL TORMENTS.

Or, an Examination of Rev. 14: 9 to 14.

BY THE EDITOR.

"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

It is maintained, with great assurance, that this text teaches, that "eternity of eternities" is the period of the torments of all wicked men; and, therefore, proves them immortal.

In order to make this text available to our opponents, they must prove *three things*. *First*—That it is spoken of ALL wicked men. *Second*—That it relates to their punishment beyond this life. And, *Third*—That the term "for ever and ever" is used in its primary and absolute sense of *endless*. Neither of these points have they ever proved, and we are persuaded they never can. It is not enough for a man to *affirm* all these points: let them *be proved*. We say again, it never has been done and never can be.

1. *Is this language used in reference to all wicked men?*

We answer, *no*. It is a specified class, viz: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand." This is the *class* spoken of and threatened; and it comes almost infinitely short of embracing *all* the wicked.

Let us examine the connection and see when the "beast and his image" arose. The previous chapter shows that they did not come into existence till after the Christian era; nor indeed till the old Roman empire was in its *divided* state—as the ten horns clearly show—which could not have been earlier than the fourth or fifth century after Christ. Hence, the wicked spoken of in the text under consideration, did not embrace any that lived *before* the Christian era, nor any that lived for three or four hundred years after. Here, then, is a large exception of the wicked. But we shall probably find a still larger exception, by an inquiry as to *which* beast is spoken of; for two are mentioned, *viz:* a *ten* horned beast, and a *two* horned one: and nearly all commentators are agreed that the two horned one came up at a much later period than the other; and some doubt if it has even appeared yet. If the two horned beast is the one spoken of in the text under consideration, then an exception must be made of the wicked during the centuries that elapsed from the rise of the first to that of the second beast. Hence here is another large number of the wicked, who are not embraced in the threatening. That it is the worshippers of the two horned beast, who are threatened, seems likely from the fact, that it is that beast that causes the *image* to the first to be made. Thus another period must elapse, after the second beast arose, before men could "worship *his image;*" and hence many other wicked would not be embraced in the judgment denounced in the text we are examining. Then we must inquire *who* or *what* power this "beast and his image" represent. Protestants, quite generally, say, it symbolizes *Papacy*. If that be so, then *no Protestant sinners* are included in the text; so that none of them need fear the threatening, whatever it embraces, unless they turn Papists. Possibly the Papist might say, the beast, &c., is Protestantism. If so, then all Catholic sinners escape. Thus, we see, it is a mere *assumption* to say, "The punishment foreshown, Rev. 14: 9 to 11" is "*precisely*" that to which "*all the wicked* will be subjected," as "*D. N. Lord*" said, in his review of Dobney on Future Punishment, *Theological Journal* for 1850, p. 416.

The dynasty of rulers symbolized by this beast and his image are of late origin, if yet in existence; hence it is impossible that more than a small portion of the race of Adam can come under the threatening of chapter 14. This fact alone shows the absurdity of our opposers quoting it in support of their theory, which is, that *all* wicked men will be involved in endless torment.

2. *Does the judgment threatened in this text relate to wicked men beyond this life?*

Can our opposers prove that it does? They can *assume* it; but assumptions do not pass for evidence in these days of investigation. Have they any evidence of their position? If so, what is it? and where is it found? But as

they have none, we proceed to affirm, that those inflictions, on the worshippers of the beast and his image, relate to judgments in this life, "*on the earth,*" and not in some fancy hell in another world.

The previous chapter gave us an account not only of the beast and his image, but the threatening of the beast, "that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be *killed ;*" verse 15. To counteract this, God caused an angel to make the terrible threatening in the text; and its appropriateness to deter men from obeying the beast is apparent.

The chapter following the text opens thus—"I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven *last* plagues ; and in them is *filled up* the wrath of God." The original is, "In them was completed the wrath of God."

Mark well, these plagues are *the last* on somebody; and they are to have a *completion ;* hence it is impossible that they can be eternal, or *endless.* Now observe, verses 7 and 8, it is said, "One of the four vital beings gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God," &c. "And the temple was filled with smoke from the glory of God, and from his power ; and *no man* was able to enter into the temple, *till* the seven plagues of the seven angels *were fulfilled," or completed.*

Let it be distinctly noted, these plagues are THE LAST, and that they COMPLETE *the wrath of God* on the power to be visited ; and *also* that NO MAN can enter into the *temple of God* till they are COMPLETED. Now what follows—If these plagues, or any part of them, fall on the wicked spoken of in chap. 14: 9—11, then either no man ever can enter the temple of God, or the wrath spoken of will have been completed, or finished. Now listen—"I heard a great voice out of the temple, saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God [*where?*] UPON THE EARTH :" not in hell, nor the moon, nor any other fancy location. "And the first went and poured out his vial *upon the earth.*" Well, what happened? "And there fell a *noisome and grievous sore* upon *the men* which had THE MARK OF THE BEAST, and upon them which WORSHIPPED HIS IMAGE."

Here is the commencement of the exact fulfillment of the threatening in chap. 14. *There* we find the *threatening ; here* the wrath in a course of *accomplishment*, and it has not missed the persons threatened. These plagues are *all* to fall on men upon the earth ; chap. 16: 1; they are the "filling up of the wrath of God"—and they are "*the last :*" and till they are filled up and completed, no man can enter the temple of God: then what becomes of "*the eternity of eternities*" of their torment? It has passed away, like other *fancies of mere theorists.*

The judgments embraced in these seven last plagues are fully developed in the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th chapters, and result in the entire destruction of "*Babylon the great*"—which seems to be only another symbol of the beast. Babylon is judged, condemned, thrown down, burned with fire, and to "*be found no more at all,*" chap. 19: 21. The terrible torments inflicted on her, and her devotees, as set forth in the chapters named, is a full and perfect fulfillment of chap. 14: 9 to 11; and it is seen to be "*on the earth ;*" and no support or countenance is given to the assumption of endless sin and torment.

As we have shown that the threatened wrath is to be "upon the earth," and that it must have a *completion*, or no man can ever enter the "*temple in heaven,*" it is unnecessary to spend time to prove that the term, forever and ever, in the text, is used, as often elsewhere, to signify no more than a protracted period, without defining its exact length. We might greatly extend our remarks on this subject; but we trust we have said enough to convince all candid inquirers, and more would not avail with bigots, and dealers in mere assumptions.

"BEARING THE CROSS."

BY THE EDITOR.

Much is said, among professed Christians, about "bearing the cross;" but we fear little is understood or really practised in this manner. Some seem to think *speaking in meeting* is the cross they must bear; and when they have done that they think little more about the cross. We apprehend that is a very small item in bearing the cross. Men are all naturally in love with this present world. To this world we must become *crucified.* Crucifixion is a *hard death ;* but few persons are willing to die such a death; there is, however, no other way of entering into the kingdom of God. We must be "crucified unto the world, and the world unto" us. Most professed Christians, it is to be feared, have made a covenant with the world, not to part with it; and the tempter satisfies them if they speak in meeting some times, and give

something to support the gospel, they may keep their covenant with the world: but, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2: 15.

How then are we to be separated from the love of the world, and be crucified unto it? *First*—By a believing view of the Lord Jesus Christ, who became poor—was despised of men—a man of sorrow, acquainted with grief—endured reproach—resisted temptation, though he "*suffered*, being tempted"—when he was reviled, reviled not again—*murmured not*, though wounded, bruised, put to grief, and his soul made an offering for sin, scourged, spit upon, his hands and feet pierced with nails, his *soul in agony*—all this he bore, and no lisp of *impatience* ever escaped him. Would you be crucified unto the world, go learn of him; contemplate his poverty—his life—his sufferings—his resignation—his patience—his loving and forgiving spirit, till the whole mind is humbled within you: and then realize this truth—"If so be we *suffer* with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. Do you ask what it is to suffer with him? We answer—To suffer with the same meek, patient, forgiving, resigned spirit that he had. This leads us to say—

Second—If you would bear your cross and be crucified unto the world, REMEMBER, every trial of your life—whether *temporal* or *spiritual*, *personal* or *family*, from *friends* or *enemies*, *direct* or *indirect*, *great* or *small*, of *short continuance*, or *long*, or *whatever* be the nature or character of it, is by the *appointment* or *permission* of that God who willeth not the death of the sinner, but who is seeking by all these trials to crucify you unto the world, and fit you to be glorified with his Son Jesus Christ. How shall this design of our heavenly Father be accomplished? It cannot be, unless you "*bear your cross*." Do you ask again—What is it to bear my cross? We answer—It is to suffer all the trials, of which we have spoken, *patiently*. You are not to quarrel with the *instrumentality* God may employ, nor indulge in *fretfulness* under it. If you do you do *not* "*bear the cross*." And though you should speak like an angel in meeting, yet if you *fret* and *complain* under any of the trials of life, by which God is seeking to crucify you unto the world, it is *hypocrisy* for you to talk about your "bearing the cross"—you are but deceiving your own soul. God has assured us, "*all things work together* for good to them that love him;" Rom. 8: 28; yet, you can *murmur*, *fret*, and *complain* at those things which God has permitted or appointed!! Alas, *alas!* Do not dream you are ripening for the kingdom of God while this is the case. No, you are ripening for death—for perdition. Saith our Saviour—"In your PATIENCE *possess ye your souls*." We shall learn soon, or when it is too late, that those words are words of solemn and awful import. If you indulge in murmuring, complaining, or *impatience* at any trials, insults, sufferings, or injuries, from whatever instrumentality they may come, and that spirit is *increasing* upon you, you are just as surely traveling in the road to perdition as God has said—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die*." We speak not now of one "overtaken in a fault," to which all are *liable* in the hour of temptation, but we speak of him upon whom this spirit is not *abating* but increasing—and it is increasing, except we bear our cross *daily*: for *every day* will bring some cross, in some form. Happy the soul who is constantly looking to God for grace to bear every cross. We may pray to have the cross removed; but we may not pray for it only in submission to the will of God. "If it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not my will but thine be done." That is our *example*; and we cannot safely follow any other. "My grace is sufficient for thee," will often be the answer; and did we know *now* what we *shall know hereafter*, we should praise God for every trial and every cross we have to bear: yea, a *living faith* will praise God even now, that he does not leave us to our own way, lest we should be like the children of Israel, whose impatient murmurings were answered by giving them "flesh," but "leanness" was "sent into their souls." "*Be patient in all things*:" that is *bearing thy cross*; then, when Christ appears, you shall have A CROWN.

"WHY SERVE THE LORD?"—The following article was published in the Examiner, August, 1846. We publish it just as it was written then; not to show how true were our forebodings, but because we wish again to impress the minds of all with the importance of serving God from *principle*. At the time this article was written there was a movement on definite time for the Advent in 1847, as there is now in some parts of this country for it this year, 1854.

WHY SERVE THE LORD?

According to my observations, all, or nearly all the exhortations of professed "Adventists," to saints and sinners, to serve God, are based upon this one thing—"Do it, for the Lord is coming—You will perish then if you do not serve him."

Such exhortations are proper enough in their place: but to make *them the burden* of our message to saints and sinners, in my judgment, is nothing more than an appeal to the *selfishness* of the human heart. It seems to say—If the Lord was not coming so *soon*, you need not be so particular to serve him!!

Every child of man on earth is under just as much obligation to serve God, *with all his heart*, if Christ was not coming these hundred years, as if he was coming to-day. The obligation to serve God lies much higher than the mere fact that the day is most over. This appeal to any man will seldom, if ever, produce

genuine preparation to meet God. The *reaction* that will take place if '46 and '47 pass by as they *may*, without witnessing the advent, will be disastrous beyond all conception. Experience proves this—I mean the experience of '43 and '44. Where are the great majority of those now who, professedly, were "aroused to serve God" as *they ought* by that cry of *time* for the Lord's coming? And *echo* says—WHERE!!! Scarcely one in ten of them are now found walking so as to honor their Christian profession. *Why not?* They were stimulated by *wrong motives.* Their *selfishness* was the principal thing appealed to and excited. They were just like the sinner who thinks himself nigh to death on a sick bed or in a storm at sea. If he *must die*, he will become a *Christian.* If he knew he was out of danger, he would be as indifferent as ever. Repentance under such circumstances is always of a doubtful character; and, where the person has survived, has almost invariably proved a *delusion.* Why is it so? Because their *selfishness* was all that was moved. There was no deep sorrow for the dishonor done to God by a life of sin; or abhorrence of sin on that account. No: if they could escape the dreadful consequences which they *fear* for their sins, no penitence would be seen in them; they would still "roll sin as a sweet morsel under their tongues." Just so the preaching of *definite time* for the advent, and urging sinners to get ready, *because* the Lord was coming so soon, and they would be destroyed if not ready, has been *demonstrated*, in general, to have had no other effect upon saint or sinner than to move their *selfish* feelings. The cause of excitement failing, they are the same careless souls as ever, or seeking *new* fancies to keep up their excited minds, which must result, if repeated disappointments occur, in deep disaster if not in ultimate ruin. Not a few have already passed into that state of mind that must, without an extraordinary exertion of the grace of God, land them in endless ruin.

For what are Christ's disciples left *in* this world? Is it just to get safe *out of it?* Or, is it to *glorify* God and the Lamb upon earth? Or, which is the same thing, it is, that they may be *lights in the world:* yea, "THE LIGHT OF *the world*"—that they may "let" their "light so shine before men that *they* may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." Who has God to glorify him on earth? The Son of God is not here to do it. He was here, and said, when about to leave,—"*I have finished the work* Thou *gavest me* to do." He is not here now to glorify God before men. Angels *cannot* do that work on earth: wicked men *will not* do it. Who then shall do it? *The followers of Christ.* Are they under any more obligation to do it if their Lord is to return to-day than if he was not coming for a hundred years? Certainly not. To show a greater concern to do so on that account, manifests too much the spirit of an eye-servant. He thinks the master is soon coming—the day is nearly ended—he will be all engaged in the work just at that moment!! He has been sluggish all the day—has taken little or no interest in his master's cause, and would have done nothing only he was "afraid." Efforts have been made to rouse him to his duty to his employer—all has been unavailing till he is told that employer is coming: he is then aroused and outstrips all the other laborers in activity and zeal!! Is it love to his employer and his service that has thus aroused him? Not at all. His course is perfectly hypocritical. He thinks to secure the master's favor by his present extraordinary exertions, and perhaps is ready to condemn those who have kept constantly engaged in their work all the day long, because they do not just now manifest the same zeal and activity that he does. He is now all activity, I repeat it, not from love to the work or the master; but, the *reckoning time is so near;* and he has just cause to fear condemnation for his past neglect. Watch that man carefully. The report that the master was coming at that particular time proves to be erroneous, and it is now uncertain when he will come. What do we now see? Ten chances to one if you do not see that same zealous *do-every-thing*, when he thought the master was right upon him, now slack off—grow weary—lay down—fall asleep, and perhaps never wake again till the cry—"*The master is here.*"

Let us work while it is day—and *all* the day; and work too, because—We have a good Master, who has loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood. Let gratitude to him stimulate us to do all in our power to promote his honor or glory in the earth. Have we no concern for the glory of God and the Lamb? Have we any too much time to do this work in? Shall we wish, like the eye-servant, the day was gone? If so, do we not discover *more* concern for *rest*, or *wages*, than we do to have accomplished *much* for God and our Lord Jesus Christ? Should we not be as ready and cheerful to labor and suffer too, to promote the glory of God in a wicked world, as to reap the promised reward? And should we not rejoice, if we are accounted worthy to be continued longer in the field, that we may sow and reap a larger crop for our blessed, loving Lord and Master? Why this haste to have our labors and suffering for Christ ended? Should we not rather desire that we may be able to do and suffer *much* for him who has done and suffered *so much* for us? Oh, my brother, let us leave the "times and the seasons" for the coming of the Son of God where he taught us to leave them, viz. "in the Father's own power," Acts 1: 6, 7, and go to our work in the *love of it*, that *we* may glorify God on the earth and finish the work he has given *us* to do; then we need have no fear but that when he comes, however sudden or unexpected it may be, he will give us the "*crown of life.*" Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself, is just as obliga

tory, on us all, at any period of life, or any age of the world, as the day the Lord will come: and no period, or time of the world, can change, alter, abate, or increase that obligation. To suppose it can, it appears to me, is a delusion. The Bible injunction—"Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, *do all to the glory of God*," is unalterable, and depends not upon circumstances or times. Under this unalterable principle Enoch walked with God 300 years—Noah at least 120 years—Abraham many years—Samuel over 90 years: and many other worthies for long periods. It is our duty, as well as exalted calling, to begin our life in the service of God, and spend *all* our days in this soul ennobling work of bringing glory to God and the Lamb in this benighted world. May the Lord forgive us all our sins and follies past, and give us grace for time to come: and may *his glory*, not our own, be the *ruling principle* of our minds.

—

In the same Examiner with the foregoing we published the following:

HAS IT COME TO THIS?

The following paragraph is taken from the "Voice of Truth"* of the 12th ult.—

"We are glad to see our brethren in many places waking up on the *time* of the second advent of Christ. It is a fundamental doctrine in the inspired articles of our faith. It will not do to strike that article from our infallible creed, nor become unbelieving in its immutable truths."

I agree with the *Voice* that the *Bible* is an "*infallible creed.*" But, is the interpretation he and his correspondents give that "*creed*," on the subject of definite *time* for the second advent "*infallible?*" *Time*, more than once, has shown that *it is not:* and "my faith is very strong" that the same teacher will show them again that *they* are *fallible*, and of "*like passions*" with other men. There is an "appearance of evil" in the paragraph quoted above from the Voice. It seems to say—"*We* are *infallible* on this point: and those who do not receive the theory that *we* have, do *strike articles* from the Bible." Our Brother of the Voice cannot *mean* any such thing; though his language seems to imply it. But I think I know him too well to believe he would intentionally do any such thing. Yet, his strong attachment to his theory of *time* may have led him wide, in this matter, of his usual charity. He says, in the quotation above—"The *time* of the second advent of Christ is a *fundamental* doctrine in the inspired articles of our faith"—the Bible. What is a "fundamental doctrine?" It is an "*essential*" doctrine. Does the Voice mean to say the *time* doctrine is essential to the *truth of the Bible?* or, essential to *his theory?* or, essential to *salvation?* If he means the first or the last I must dissent from him. The truth of the Bible rests not upon the interpretation of fallible men. Our salvation rests not upon the belief of any man's interpretation of the Bible; but upon *faith* in Christ as the only Saviour—the Son of God; and in *obedience* to him. Let all beware of reviving again the *positive* spirit that characterized the "10th day movement" of '44. A doctrine that is "fundamental," or essential to salvation must be received, or the man is lost. Shall any man *decide* what is essential to the salvation of his brother in matters that have no higher authority than the *opinion* of fallible man? The Voice or any one else has a right to an opinion that definite time for the second advent is revealed in the Bible. If they really have the evidence clear to their minds it is revealed, then the belief of it is essential to *their* salvation. Because the disbelief of it, under such circumstances, would show in their hearts a want of reliance on what God has said. To him that thinketh it is sin, not to believe in definite time for the advent, *to him* it is sin; not because it is sin *in itself*, but because he believes the Bible clearly teaches it; hence not to believe it would be to reject the Bible itself. *I* do not believe the Bible teaches any such doctrine; but, that it teaches just the opposite, *viz.*, that the time is *not* revealed and cannot be known by any prophetic numbers; and that our Lord has taught us it should not be *thus* known. To *me*, then, with my present light, it would be sin to advocate the same theory that the Voice says is "a fundamental doctrine." Shall I sin to please men? Shall I fear any denunciation that man can hurl against me? "In every nation he that *feareth God* and worketh righteousness is accepted of him." Thus found when he shall appear all will be well, however sudden he shall come.

* Now the Advent Harbinger.

PERSONALITY OF CHRIST.

BY J. PANTON HAM.

1 EPISTLE TIM. iii., 16.

"And openly it is a great sacrament of piety that thing that was showed in flesh."—*Wiclif's Translation.* "And without nay great is that mystery of godliness, God was showed in the flesh."—*Tyndale.* "And without doubt great is that mystery of godliness God was showed in the flesh."—*Cranmer.* "And without nay great is the mystery of godliness, God is showed in the flesh."—*Geneva Version.* "And manifestly it is a great sacrament of piety which was manifested in flesh."—*Rheimish Version.* "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in the flesh."—*Common Version.* "And confessedly great is the mystery of religion, God was made visible in flesh."—*New Translation.*

A primary official distinction of the Lord Jesus Christ is, that he is the Medium or Mediator by whom we obtain the most perfect knowledge of God. "The Word became flesh," that he might embody and express in a human form and life the character and perfections of

the invisible Jehovah. His mission is that of a Representative and Deputy charged to communicate through the medium of his own personality the actual moral attitude and purposes of God in relation to mankind. He is God's Plenipotentiary, for in him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily; he is God's Viceroy, for all power is given to him in heaven and in earth; and he is God's Personal Representative, for he is "the image of the invisible God," —the "express image of his person." As such, it is evident that Christ came into the world, not so much to attract attention to himself as a personality distinct from God, but through himself to lead up the thoughts, affections, and servitude of mankind to his God and our God, to his Father and our Father. Hence the peculiarity of those frequent expressions,—"the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works." "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." "I can of mine own self do nothing." To regard the personal nature of Christ, then, as a primary question of Christian investigation, and to insist upon the profession of a definite opinion thereon, appears to us to be losing sight of the primary purpose of Christ's manifestation, and to be converting into a metaphysical problem for the exercise of the speculative faculty, that which was never intended to stand before the scalpel of the intellect at all, but to be the medium of the divine manifestation,—the most perfect of all the theophanies of Jehovah, for the purpose of rejoicing and reforming the heart. We cannot, therefore, for our own part, take a dogmatic position on this question of the Saviour's personality. We can neither accept the Trinitarian nor the Unitarian dogma. Both of these extremes appear to us to be wide of the truth, which occupies, as we think, some undefinable stand point between the two. We say, undefinable, because we accept the authority of him whose individuality is the subject of debate, and who has said, with unequivocal plainness, "*No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father.*" In our judgment this declaration of Christ's puts a veto upon the inquiry, and ought to have sufficed to prevent its ever becoming an inquiry at all.

We have said thus much before in an earlier paper on "the Doctrine of the Cross," and we have repeated it again, because we are anxious to divert our readers' attention from that unprofitable controversy about the personality of Christ, which has been so fruitful, in its past history, of "envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness." At best it is but a metaphysical speculation of no important practical issues. What religious advantage does either the Unitarian or the Trinitarian dogma bring to its possessor? It may be said in reply,—Is that to be considered a mere question of speculative metaphysics, and of no practical religious concernment, which ascribes divine honors to one who, however high in the scale of humanity, is after all, but human? But he who would ask this question elevates to a paramount lordship of his life and conscience that very being to whom he cannot, with the Trinitarian, ascribe divine honor. And is not He, who is Lord of life and conscience, who is the Master of the moral manhood,—the present moral Governor, and future Judge—virtually holding a divine relation, exercising divine authority, and so far fulfilling divine functions? Practically, even, to the denier of Christ's divinity, Christ is divine. And such being the case, what has the Trinitarian to boast of above his Unitarian brother? He *does* no more than give himself up, like his fellow Christian of the opposite speculative faith, to the rule and authority of Christ. But he has a different *theory* about Christ. True, he has, but he had better say little about his theory, for it is not absolutely proof against texts and logic. If both have yielded themselves up to Christ to be directed and saved by him, then why not agree to differ in the speculative aspect of the question, when, with all their difference, they so substantially agree? *Sic itur ad astra*, may be said of both and what more is needed?

We presume to think that our stand-point is just that point where both these extremes of opinion may find a common meeting place, and mutual recognition. To some extent it satisfies both speculative theologies, supplies a common phraseology, and serves the common spiritual want. The Unitarian may hold his theory about the personality of Christ, and the Trinitarian his, but did they both recognize Christ as the medial manifestation of God,—the mirror for the reflection of the divine glory,—the representative and image of the invisible God, then they would meet at a common centre, meet practically, meet to worship. Their speech would not so easily offend one another,—they could scarcely do other than both speak the same thing. All they hear and see in Christ would be as if they heard and saw God. His virtue would be the manifestation of God's virtue,—his love, of God's love, his condescension and forbearance, the reflection of God's,—his power, God's—his words, God's—all God's, he in God, and God in him,—"God manifest in the flesh." We think that this is the true idea of Christ, the idea given of him in the Scriptures of truth. In our apprehension he is the Model of God, the last and most perfect manifestation of God, superseding the Shekinah, and all other special manifestations of the Blessed Invisible.

Man has ever been forbidden at high penalties to make a graven image of God, because man would make an image after his own imperfect ideal of the Divine. But was there not another reason for this prohibition? The fact has shown that God himself intended to meet this felt want of humanity,—the want of a visible concentration of the object of worship, by providing his own image in the person of him who is "the image of the invisible God, the express image of His person." Let us not, then, abuse this "unspeakable Gift" of God, by speculating on the profound mystery of his personality, but

receive it for the rejoicing of our hearts, and the reformation of our life; and thus show, by a living and fruitful faith, that, however our intellectual judgments may differ, "God hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." —*Christian Examiner.*

FROM DANIEL HULL.

Plymouth, Ind.

Br. Storrs:—I wish to make a suggestion or two which may be profitable to some of your readers.

Ministers in commenting on Ezekiel, 18 : 4, say, the passage "means a banishment from God's presence." Yet they say—and many of their D. D.'s. agree with them in saying—that "God himself is to be present at the torment of the wicked, to see that the punishment is properly administered." Now, how is it possible for the wicked to be banished from the presence of the Lord, and yet the Lord himself, in person, be present with them? I know that I will be accused of "prying into matters too deep" for me; and I fear it is rather too deep to get an answer from the friends of the dogma; yet I consider it my privilege, as well as my duty, to examine the Word of God with the traditions of men, and if their constructions are unreasonable, I do not consider it my duty to adopt them, though I may be called an "infidel."

Yours in hope of immortality at the coming of Christ.

FROM E. M. SMITH.

Batavia, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—I am glad that you make the Life and Death theme the object and end of your valuable sheet. Men are selfish, and so long as you contribute to their interest all is well; but when you deviate from that, you are wicked, abominable, and should be shunned as an errorist. The Examiner is calculated, under God, to do a great work in this nineteenth century of error, superstition, and false religion; and I would to God, that many more such sheets, breathing their healthful, invigorating, and life-giving influence, might start up in different localities, in opposition to this popular, but heathen dogma, from the Platonic school, that man has inherent immortality; and show from the Bible that God alone hath immortality; and if man would have it he must seek for it by patiently continuing in well doing. We must comply with the condition God has given and revealed unto us in His Word. Says the Saviour, "I am the way, the truth, and the Life." Again, "I am the door of the sheepfold, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber." It is alone through Christ that we get immortality or eternal life. He is the only medium, or door, through which we can enter; and he emphatically declares, that he is "the resurrection and the life;" and he that believeth on him notwithstanding he may be dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth (by this process) shall never die. There is no doctrine more fully taught in all the Scriptures than the one you advocate, that the resurrection of man to life and immortality, from the dead, is alone through Christ our Life-giver. May God's blessing rest upon you in this effort of disseminating truth: and may He preserve you blameless unto His coming and kingdom, is the prayer of your friend who is in the hope of the gospel.

FROM E. T. HARDING.

Rensselaer, Indiana, Feb. 1, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—I am happy to send you a few more subscribers to your valuable paper. I think one year ago you had but one here; now you have eleven. Your "Six Sermons" have spoken for themselves; but we could not do much till we had Brother and Sister Mansfield, and they opened the door and a great many have embraced the doctrine. I do wish we could have a preacher come this way and revive the people. "Truly the harvest is great, but the laborers are few." My prayer is that you may prosper with your paper and have your reward. I should be sorry to see it published less than once every two weeks, and should be glad to see its face every week. I hope the time is not far distant when it will be issued every week; and I shall ever be ready to send you a subscriber. Wm. Webster, who took your paper from this place, is dead. The old man was here all alone in the faith, and while he was sick Br. Mansfield came here, but the old man died without hearing them; but you have no idea how we made derision of his belief: we thought him worse than an infidel. All I wish is, that he might have lived to see so many as there is here in the faith.

ANCIENT HEATHENS AND IMMORTALITY.

The same may be said of the ancient heathens, they did but conjecture, without proof, of a future state. And there is this remarkable circumstance to be noticed in addition, that those who taught the doctrine (as the ancient heathen lawgivers themselves did, from a persuasion of its importance for man's conduct), do not seem themselves to have *believed* what they taught, but to have thought merely of the expediency of inculcating this belief on the vulgar.

It does not appear, however, that they had much success in impressing their doctrine on the mass of the people; for though a state of future rewards and punishments was commonly talked of among them, it seems to have been regarded as little more than an *amusing fable.* It does not appear, from the account of their own writers, that men's lives were ever influenced by any such belief. On the contrary, we

find them, in speeches publicly delivered and now extant, *ridiculing the very notion of any one's seriously* believing the doctrine.

It may be thought, however, by some, that the wisest of the heathen philosophers, though they did not hold the notions of the vulgar as to the particulars of a future state of rewards and punishments, yet had convinced themselves (as in their writings they profess) of the immortality of the soul. And it is true that they had, in a certain sense; but in such a sense as in fact makes the doctrine amount to nothing at all. They imagined that the souls of men, and *of all other animals*, were not created by God, but were themselves parts of the divine mind, from which they were separated when united with bodies, and to which they would return and be re-united on quitting those bodies; so that the soul, according to this notion, was immortal both ways; that is, not only was to have *no end*, but had *no beginning*, and was to return after death into the same condition in which it was before our birth,—a state without any distinct personal existence or consciousness. It was the *substance of which the soul is composed*, that (according to this doctrine) was eternal rather than the soul itself, which as a distinct being, was swallowed up and put an end to. Now it would be ridiculous to speak of any consolation, or any moral restraint, or any other effect whatever, springing from the belief of *such* a future state as this, which consists in becoming after death, the same as we were before birth. To all practical purposes, it is the same thing as annihilation.

Accordingly the apostle Paul, when speaking to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv.) of some persons who denied the "*Resurrection* of the dead," (teaching, perhaps, some such doctrine as that I have just been speaking of) declares, in that case his "preaching would have been vain." To deny the "*Resurrection*," is, according to him, to represent Christians as "having hope *in this life* only," and those "who have fallen asleep in Christ, as having *perished*" (verse 18, 19). As for any such future existence as the ancient philosophers described, he does not consider it worth a thought.

Such was the boasted discovery of the heathen sages! which has misled many inattentive readers of their works; who, finding them often profess the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and not being aware what sort of immortality it was that they meant, have hastily concluded that they had discovered something approaching to the truth; or, at least, that the doctrine was one which might have some practical effect on the feelings and conduct, which it is plain it never could. And such, very nearly, is said to be the belief entertained now by the learned among the East-Indian Bramins, though they teach a different doctrine to the vulgar.—*Archbishop Whately.*

PICK'S BIBLE STUDENT'S CONCORDANCE can be had on the terms named in the Ex. for Jan. 1.

PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, &c.—We have received various communications of this kind recently, but have hardly had time to examine any of them.

"WHO IS THE MESSIAH? *In two parts: showing the Past and Future Events in the prophetic chain of his Messiahship:* By Eld. Z. Campbell."

This work seems to be well arranged, and we should think must be interesting. The author says, "In presenting" this work "it is not the writer's intention to teach what he believes, or what somebody else believes; but what the Scriptures say, in plain terms. Messiah will *do*, *suffer*, or cause to be done; whether anybody believes it or not; and, in presenting his prophetic chain, the object is, to show how many links are in the past, and how many are future." The work is a neat 12 mo. pamphlet, of 108 pages, published by J. G. Arthur, Hartford, Conn.; also for sale by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton street, New York.

—

"THE AGE OF GOSPEL LIGHT; *to which is added* THE NARROW ESCAPE; or, *Immortality only through Jesus Christ;*" is an 18 mo. pamphlet of 96 pages, by the same author, and for sale as above. So far as we have been able to examine it, it is interesting; and the Narrow Escape is quite an amusing Dialogue between a *Literalist* Elder and a *Spiritualist* "Deacon." Success to it, on its mission.

—

"THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY: A Discourse delivered in Rochester before the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, July 12, 1853, by FRANCIS WAYLAND, President of Brown University"—"REVIEWED BY J. B. COOK."

This is a neat 18 mo pamphlet of 72 pages. The *Reviewer* endeavors to show that Dr. Wayland is too "superficial, circumscribed, and suggestive of essential error—that of relying, at least, too much, on an arm of flesh;" and that "the essentials of Gospel Truth seem wanting." We presume the Dr. is *wanting*, and that his divinity may be *sick*, and we dare say Elder Cook has shown it.

—

"HISTORY OF NEW AMSTERDAM; OR, NEW YORK AS IT WAS, *in the days of the* DUTCH GOVERNORS. *Together with papers on events Connected with the American Revolution: and on Philadelphia in the times of William Penn.* BY PROFESSOR A. DAVIS, Corresponding Member of the New York Historical Society, Hon-

orary member of the New York Society of Letters, and formerly Chaplain of the New York Senate. Six fine illustrations. R. T. Young, Publisher, 140 Fulton street, New York."

This is a bound volume of 240 pages, 18 mo. and very interesting, but *much too brief.* That is a good failing.

"The Christian Examiner, *Edited by J. Panton Ham, Minister of the Congregational Free Church*, Bristol," England, for January, has come to hand. It is very interesting.

Our Friends have sent us various newspapers with articles to notice. Some of them may be worthy of attention, but we cannot say how soon we shall find time to look at them all.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS,

For Sale at the Office of Bible Examiner.

We affix to each work the rate of postage when prepaid.

"Bible vs. Tradition."—A thorough refutation of the doctrine of natural immortality, and of endless sin and suffering. A most searching work of 312 pages, 12 mo. Price 75 cents: or ten copies for $5. Postage 15 cents.

"Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. by H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister, England." A calm, clear and convincing argument, showing that the wages of sin is *death; not life* in misery. We have the "*Second Part*" only on hand, at present, and that in paper covers. This part contains over 200 pages, and is extremely interesting. Sold at the very low price of 25 cents: or six copies for $1. Postage 6 cents.

"The Unity of Man, or Life and Death Realities. A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by *Anthropos.*" This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of the soul. It contains 122 pages, 18 mo., in paper covers. Price 15 cents, or *ten* copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"Six Sermons, by *Geo. Storrs*: An inquiry. *Are the wicked Immortal?*" to which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on "*The Second Death!*" About one hundred thousand copies of the Six Sermons have been sold since first preached in 1842. The work will speak for itself. It has 128 pages, 18 mo. Price 15 cents in paper covers: or *ten* copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"Storrs' Miscellany." It contains the *two* foregoing works, with various Tracts, bound in one volume. Price 50 cents, or *six* copies for $2. Postage *nine cents.*

"Dialogues on Future Punishment, by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A most valuable and convincing work, which ought to be in the hands of every person where the gospel is preached. It is a pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo., Price *ten* cents: or 14 copies for $1. Postage *one* cent.

"Death not Life; *or the Theological Hell and Endless Misery Disproved;* and the Doctrine of Destruction Established, by a collection and explanation of all passages on future punishment; also metaphysical arguments for the immortality of the wicked exploded; by Jacob Blain, Baptist Minister." 120 pages, 12 mo. Price 25 cents in paper covers.

Postage 4 cents: or we will send *five* copies for $1, and prepay the postage.

Br. Moncrieff, in his Expositor, Edinburgh, Scotland, thus speaks of this work:—

We could not, perhaps, better characterize this work than by saying that it is, in the fullest sense of the expression, all that its title professes it to be. Every passage of Scripture, bearing on the momentous doctrine of future punishment, is brought forth and examined; and their invariable testimony is shown to be, that the final doom of the lost is an utter and everlasting destruction. Every objection is manfully met, and successfully overthrown,—every stronghold of the heathenish dogma of immortal-soulism falls, broken to pieces beneath the ponderous sledge-hammer of the author's reasoning. To every diligent Bible-student, we cordially recommend this able little treatise. Across the wide ocean we bid its author God speed. We feel assured that in the wide Continent of America, a rich harvest waits on his earnest and pious labors.

"Life and Death; or, The Theology of the Bible in Relation to Human Immortality; by Rev. J. Panton Ham," Bristol, England. Also, "The Generations Gathered and Gathering; or, The Scripture Doctrine Concerning Man in Death," by the same author.

These works are each published in a double Examiner, with covers. Price, *ten cents* single copy: or $7 per hundred. Without charge to all *Preachers* who will read them. Let them continue to be scattered. Postage *one* cent.

"Theology of Paul; or, *The Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as Taught in the Epistles of Paul;* by H. L. Hastings." A pamphlet of 48 pages, 12 mo. Price, *six cents* single; or $4 per 100. Postage *one* cent.

"Our Israelitish Origin, or *Lectures on Ancient Israel*, by J. Wilson," England. This work has no connection with the others in the foregoing list, but is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. It is deeply interesting. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 in paper covers, with a liberal discount to wholesale purchasers, *for cash.* Postage 14 cents bound, and *nine* cents in paper covers.

All works sent at the expense of the purchaser. But if the amount for postage is remitted us, with the price of the work ordered, we will see it *pre-paid.*

Address George Storrs, *New York.*

BIBL

NO IMMORTALI

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED
At No. 130
TERMS.—One
Always

GEO. STORRS, EDIT

IMMOR

BY H. L

"*Who only h*

God is unlike Man—
Finite and the Infinite
created—Who shall u
each other? Who sh
to a level with humani
to say, in impious flatt
ity, ye shall be as Go
of distinction between
them we may—compa
All things tell us of
clare his glory. The
handiwork. Day unto
night unto night show
Great Cause and so
Earth in her orbit a
and silent declaration.
voice and hands in a
vast organ of humanit
as it may be, arises the
Universal intuition poi
says, Behold your God
I cannot comprehend
cannot comprehend the
grass or stalk of corn.
might question concern
satisfy my cavils. I do
do not understand light
electricity, and yet I
How then can I be exc
to have dominion over
of my faith within the
understanding?
The child cannot co
shall he therefore reject
A workman may not co
the architect under wh
but does it follow that t
ble?
If there be a God of
glory, and power, who
surely his character mus
that we cannot possibly
tent.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, MARCH 1, 1854. NO. 5.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY
At No. 130 Fulton-street.
TERMS.--One Dollar for the Year;
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

IMMORTALITY.

BY H. L. HASTINGS.

"*Who only hath Immortality.*"

God is unlike Man—Man is unlike God. The Finite and the Infinite—the created and the uncreated—Who shall undertake to liken them to each other? Who shall dare to degrade Deity to a level with humanity? or who shall presume to say, in impious flattery, to miserable humanity, ye shall be as God's? How wide the line of distinction between man and God. Contrast them we may—compare them we cannot.

All things tell us of a God. The heavens declare his glory. The expanse discloseth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth the knowledge of the Great Cause and source of life and being. Earth in her orbit answers to their constant and silent declaration. The Deep lifts up her voice and hands in adoration; and from the vast organ of humanity, shattered and untuned as it may be, arises the same solemn declaration. Universal intuition points man heaven-ward and says, Behold your God.

I cannot comprehend God, neither can you. I cannot comprehend the growing of one blade of grass or stalk of corn. I believe it, and yet I might question concerning it, and no man could satisfy my cavils. I do not understand life; I do not understand light; I cannot comprehend electricity, and yet I know that they exist. How then can I be excused, if I allow ignorance to have dominion over faith, and limit the range of my faith within the circle of my imperfect understanding?

The child cannot comprehend mathematics, shall he therefore reject their demonstrations? A workman may not comprehend the design of the architect under whose direction he labors, but does it follow that the design is unintelligible?

If there be a God of might, and majesty, and glory, and power, who upholdeth all things, surely his character must so far exceed our own that we cannot possibly comprehend it in its extent.

The peculiar qualities and characteristics which distinguish the Supreme from all other beings are termed attributes.

One of these attributes is Omnipotence. We are weak as bruised reeds; we are frail we are dependent, we are impotent. But God hath all power. We see indications of it on every side. We tremble at the majestic manifestations of nature's forces, and with what awe should we look from Nature up to nature's God. Even the Lord God Omnipotent? O how weak and puny does man appear when contrasted with the Lord, slow to anger, great in power, who buildeth his stories in the heavens, who layeth the beams of his timbers upon the waters, who sitteth in the circle of the earth, who spreadeth out the heavens as a tent; who hath his way in the whirlwind and the storm—and the clouds are the dust of his feet; who bringeth the princes to nothing; who counteth the nations as the drop of the bucket, as less than nothing and vanity.

But God is All-wise. His omniscience is as visible as his omnipotence. Wisdom and power are alike displayed in all his works and ways. We are ignorant. We learn but little—we forget most of that. We comprehend but little, and our wisdom extendeth but a little ways. He knoweth all things. The secret thoughts of every heart are open before him. On his listening ear fall the loudest voices and the faintest wishes of the Universe. Darkness is light before him. The deep discloses to him her hidden wonders. He declareth the end from the beginning, from ancient times the things that are not yet done.

We are limited to a locality. We are here today—no where else—a few feet suffice to contain us and all that appertaineth to us. Bars and bolts may confine us, or the grave may open its unsatisfied jaws and hide us in its insatiate bowels. God is Omnipresent. The eyes of the Lord are in every place. If we ascend to heaven he is there. If we make our bed in the dark resting places of the departed he is there. If we take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth, even there his all pervading presence hems us in on every hand. Here he upholds a planet in its mighty whirl—there he watches the sparrow in its fall. Here he presides over the angelic multitudes—there he numbers the hairs of the Christian's head. Here he receives the swelling anthems of cherubim and seraphim who cry aloud—there his listening ear catches the faintest sigh of a pleading penitent, or the lowest whisper of a trusting child. Now he speaks and a

world is created—there he kindles it in flames. Now he commands and it stands fast—then at his bidding it reels to and fro. Now he rolls the waves of a shoreless ocean above a deluged world, and pours from above his torrents and his water-floods—then he lifts again the buried earth from beneath the burying waters, and hangs the golden bow of promise upon the rear of the retreating storm. GREAT GOD, how wondrous are thy ways! How majestic thy power! how matchless thy wisdom!

What is man? Can *he* lay claim to these attributes? Never!

There is another attribute which we have space to notice—*Self-existence*, or *Immortality*. *We* are frail, mortal, and perishable. *Our* life is a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then vanisheth away. But Jehovah is the Everliving, Everlasting God. *He* only hath immortality. By Immortality we understand a *deathless*, *indestructible*, *unceasing* principle. Lacking this *we* are subject to decay and death,—possessing it the Almighty abideth forever, exempt from all the perishability and mortality to which the human family are subjected.

In agreement with the text, the Apostle, 1 Timothy 1: 17, speaks of "*the King Eternal*, IMMORTAL, *invisible*,—*the only wise God.*" There are many kings on earth, but no "*invisible*" kings,—there are many kings on earth, but no "Eternal" kings,—there are many kings on earth, but, by a parity of reasoning, there *are* and *can be no* IMMORTAL kings. The expression "THE KING IMMORTAL" clearly confines and limits the attribute of immortality to "*the only wise God.*"

Thus Jesus speaks of "THE LIVING FATHER," John 6: 57. Now we know that every father is a *living* father at some time, and all the fathers whom Jesus then addressed, were *living* fathers, but the significance of the expression is due to the fact that all other fathers were *dying fathers*, and would be *dead* fathers by and by. So he could refer to the fathers that did eat manna in the desert and were *dead*, and then by an easy contrast inform them that he derived his authority and commission from the LIVING, the EVERLIVING FATHER, "*who only hath immortality.*"

But our progenitors once lent a willing ear to the seductive and deceptive falsehoods of one who "*was a Liar from the beginning.*" *Deification* and *exemption from death*, or *immortality*, were the magnificent cheats displayed as prizes which they might win by the violation of the divine prohibition, "*Ye shall not surely* DIE. *Ye shall be as* GODS." These words fell sweetly on the ear of vanity and ambition. The experiment was tried and proved a lamentable failure, but still that same old phantom dances, in its mocking brilliance, before the vision of a world that "by wisdom knows not God."

In opposition to the teachings of the apostle, the heathen philosophers had previously taught somewhat extensively the doctrine that human souls were immortal. A portion of the Jews, namely, the Pharisees (with some other minor sects) who crucified our Lord, had imbibed the same opinion. While this opinion, so flattering to human vanity, was prevailing, the apostle cautions his brethren to beware of "*philosophy*," and also forbids them to give heed to "*Jewish fables*;" and in opposition to the heathen, Pharasaic, and philosophic notion of the immortality of the soul, he opposes the word of truth, declaring that God "*only hath immortality.*"

Men love darkness rather than light. Hence notwithstanding the admonitions of the apostle, and notwithstanding his positive and reiterated declarations with regard to this topic, the doctrine of human immortality found its way into the Christian Church. There fostered by philosophic preachers, eagerly cherished by converted and half Christianized heathens, upheld by interested papal priests, environed with popish anathemas, hedged in by the thorns and briars of papal bulls, and decrees of general councils, transmitted unexamined and almost unquestioned from father to son through the years of many generations, it is no wonder that it has budded, and blossomed, and filled the face of the world with fruit. Fruit too that resembles the apples of Sodom, far more than it does that blessed fruit that overhangs the stream of Life in the midst of the Paradise of God.

But still the word of God remaineth steadfast. We may believe not, "*yet he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself;*" and though mortals may exalt themselves, and deify *each other*, yet the truth remains unshaken—He "only hath immortality."

It shall be our purpose in the present tract to oppose to the traditions of men, the word of Almighty God. Men suppose, and teach, that every individual is possessed of an undying or immortal soul, or spirit, which is destined to exist forever whether obedient or disobedient, whether a friend or an enemy of God, whether complying with his requisitions or disclaiming allegiance to him, whether sitting meekly at his feet as an obedient and teachable listener looking to him for life and every blessing, or assuming his prerogatives and laying claim to his attributes.

To this view I shall oppose certain reasons drawn *solely* from the *word of the Lord*. This shall be the man of my counsel—the teacher to whose declarations I shall yield my unquestioning and cordial assent.

Believing from evidence which I have investigated and found conclusive, that the Scriptures contain the record of God's will, the transcript of the divine mind, I shall accept their word as my only source of information with regard to this important topic.

First then, the popular doctrine of human immortality is proved to be false by reference to the Scriptural account of man's origin or creation.

We reject the vague traditions and mythological fooleries of heathendom, with regard to

this subject. We are confident there is no gleam of radiance here which shall assist us in our investigation. We pass by those learned philosophers who rather than believe the word of God are laboring to deduce their origin from tadpoles, apes, monkeys, baboons, and ourang-outangs. To avoid discussion, we admit for the moment that *they* may have sprung from such a source. We would not rob them of the glory which they may inherit, or the joy they may experience while contemplating the ancestrial dignity, which they so richly deserve, as the lineal descendants of such exalted progenitors! But for ourselves we prefer to seek wisdom of God—so shall we be guided into all truth.

Did Moses in compliance with the divine purpose give us an account of the origin of the human race? He did. He gives us the only record concerning it that does not insult our reason and mock our faith.

Here then we look for an intimation of man's nature. If when God created a perishable human form that must crumble beneath the fingers of time, within the lapse of a few fleeting years, and if he at the same time introduced into that man an immortal element destined to exist so long as God exists—then certainly in the account of the creative process we shall have a brief announcement of the facts relating to man's external formation, and a more full and perfect record of the origin and character of that more important part, the immortal soul. Our expectation is but reasonable. Certainly we have a right to anticipate such intimations in the outset as shall enable us to obtain a proper conception of the frailty of our mortal bodies, and the superior dignity of the celestial tenants that occupy them. Let us then examine this record and observe whether our anticipations prove to be in conformity to the facts in the case.

Gen. 1: 26, 27; 2: 7,—"*And God said let us make man in our image after our likeness: . . . . So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.*"

Here is the record. This is the inspired and authentic record of the origin of our race. Is the *word* immortality found here? Not at all. Is the *idea* of human immortality here? Not at all. No person taking the words of Moses in the age in which he wrote them, and receiving them in the obvious sense in which they were used, would ever have had the faintest conjecture that there was in this man, thus created, a divine and immortal element. There is not the slightest intimation of such a fact in the whole history.

But where facts fail, the aid of fancy is often invoked; and where the testimony of Scripture is wanting, human conjecture and inference is made to supply the deficiency.

In accordance with this principle there are three expressions in the passages quoted which are made to give countenance to the modern notion of human immortality. *First*, It is alleged that as man was created in the image of God, he is therefore immortal. But is there one vestige of evidence that the image of God is *immortality?* Where do the Scriptures give countenance to such an idea? No where! And we have just as good a right to say, that man was Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent, because in the image of God, as to say that he is *immortal.* If the image of God comprehends one of his *attributes* it comprehends all. Why not?

Concerning the image of God we may not feel competent to present a definite view. It may however be remarked, in passing, that it was something which he retained after his transgression (Gen. 9: 6). A careful examination of the context may afford us some light. God had created the world. It had no ruler. Whoever ruled it must be possessed of an authority delegated from the Almighty. Hence he would occupy the place of a God, or Supreme ruler, over this portion of the Universe. (Compare Exodus 4: 16).

The REV. DR. M. J. RAPHHALL, a Jew, and head master of the Hebrew National School at Birmingham, renders Gen. 1: 26. "*God said, we will make man in our image, after our likeness,* THAT THEY (BEAR) RULE *over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and every reptile that moveth on the earth.*" Here it is clearly implied that the likeness alluded to regarded the authority or dominion possessed. God was supreme ruler of the Universe—man was made in his image to be ruler, or vicegerent over this earth. This view will derive confirmation from an examination of 1 Cor. 11: 3, 12. Here the matter in consideration and the point of resemblance is *authority.* and *authority* alone. "*The head of Christ is God.*" "*The head of every man is Christ*" The head of the woman is the man. "*All things*" are "*of God,*" verse 12. "*The woman is of the man,*" verse 8. "He *is the image and glory of God,*" while "*The woman is the glory of the man.*"

But we leave the subject with the remark that *whatever the image of God may signify, there is not the least* EVIDENCE *that it implies the* IMMORTALITY *of man.*

Second, it is assumed that as God breathed into man the BREATH OF LIFE, he thus communicated to him an immortal element. If the record had declared that he breathed into him the "*breath of immortality*" the point would have been established. But he says no such thing. Not one word can be found giving countenance to such an idea. This breath was breathed into his nostrils. Isaiah 2: 22, speaks of "*man whose breath is in his nostrils*" as a creature of no account. The beasts who entered the Ark "*two and two of all flesh*" possessed this same "*breath of life,*" as did those who remained without and died. Gen. 7: 15, 22. Job 34: 14, 15, *declares concerning the Almighty,* that "*if he set his heart upon man, if he gather*

unto himself HIS *Spirit and* HIS *breath; all flesh shall perish together. and man shall turn again unto dust.*" Clearly implying that man possessed in this respect an element of life common to every animate creature, and which could be recalled at pleasure by the being from whom it emanated. And Solomon, Ecc. 3: 19, obviates the necessity for further argument upon this point by the express declaration concerning man and beasts that "*they have* ALL ONE BREATH."

Hence, it is evident that this expression,—"breath of life"—no more proves the immortality of man than it does the inmortality of beasts and creeping things.

Third—The doctrine of human immortality is inferred from the declaration that "*man became a living soul.*" If the record had declared that man became an *immortal soul*, as it should and doubtless would had that been true, there would then have been no dispute about it. But it declares no such thing. Man may be a living soul for nine hundred and sixty-nine years, as was Methusalah—but what then? Why, if he dies at the expiration of the term, he is a living soul no longer. But what is the import of this phrase "*living soul*," about which so much has been said? I will give my opinion in the language of eminent scholars. Dr. Raphall renders the passage, "*and man became* AN ANIMATE CREATURE." Dr. A. Clarke declares that the original expression, "*nephesh hhaya*," is "a general term to express all creatures indued with animal life, in any of its infinitely varied gradations, from the half-reasoning *elephant* down to the stupid *potto*, or lower still, to the *polype* which seems equally to share the animal and vegetable life." Says the late learned Dr. J. Pye Smith, in Kitto's Cyclopædia of Bib. Lit., Article *Adam*—"Some of our readers may be surprised at our having translated *nephesh hhaya* by *living animal*. There are good interpreters and preachers who, confiding in the common translation, *living soul*, have maintained that here is intimated the distinctive pre-eminence of man above the inferior animals, as possessed of an immaterial and immortal spirit. But, however true that doctrine is, we should be acting unfaithfully if we were to affirm its being contained or implied in this passage. The two words are frequently conjoined in the Hebrew, and the meaning of the compound phrase will be apparent to the English reader, when he knows that our version renders it, in Gen, 1: 20, 'creature that hath life;' in verse 24 'living creature,' and so in Chap. 11: 19; 9: 12, 15, 16; and in Chap. 1: 30, 'wherein there is life." This expression therefore sets before us the ORGANIC LIFE of the animal frame."

Having thus removed, in a measure, the collected rubbish of tradition and inference, we return to the account of man's creation. "*The Lord God formed* MAN," not merely man's *body*, but "MAN *of the dust of the ground.*" The elements that entered into his composition were DUST, *not dust and divinity*, not *dust and immortality*,—but "DUST OF THE GROUND." Man was thus organized and remained destitute of vitality until his Creator "*breathed into his* NOSTRILS"—not into his brain, or some secret seat of the soul, but "*into his* NOSTRILS" "*the* BREATH OF LIFE"—not the breath of immortality, or an immortal spirit—but "*the* BREATH OF LIFE," such as was possessed by every portion of the brute creation. The result was, MAN became *a living soul, being, creature or animal.* God did not put a soul in him. God did not breathe a soul into him. But when God imparted to him the principle of life, then he became a living soul, not an *immortal soul*, not a *never-dying soul*; but simply "*a living soul.*" While this principle of *life* remains, the soul is alive; but when it returns to God who gave it, the living soul dies and becomes a *dead soul*; and is thus denominated in the Scriptures, as the Hebrew scholar may see by referring to Num. 19: 11; Hag. 2: 13. The English reader may be surprised to learn that the words *meth nephesh*, here rendered in our version *dead body*, are, literally *dead soul.* Such is the fact.

From all this, we conclude that man is not immortal: "*The first man is* OF THE EARTH, EARTHY;" 1 Cor. 15: 47. If he were immortal we should have met with an intimation of it in the account of his creation. We meet with no such intimation, therefore it is not true. Man is sometimes compared to a watch. His body is a case. His soul the watch itself. What would be thought of a man who, having invented and constructed a beautiful watch, and placed it in an earthen case, should employ a man of great abilities to give an account of its origin and history. The man commences his work under the immediate supervision of the originator of the watch, gives an account of the earthen case and then dismisses the subject! We would think he had most lamentably failed in his attempted account. And yet this is just what has been done in the Mosaic account of the creation of man, if man has within him an immortal soul. Bishop Waburton, in his Divine Legation, admits that the doctrine of human immortality is not revealed in the writings of Moses. Now let this fact be remembered. That man's soul is not immortal, or else if it is, the Almighty did not esteem the matter of sufficient importance to inspire his servant to record the fact.

THE DRAGON.

Some inquiry has recently been made of us in regard to the power symbolized by the *dragon*, called "the Devil and Satan," Rev. 20. In some articles which we wrote and published in the Examiner, 1849, we gave our opinion of the dragon power. That opinion has since been strengthened by observation and reflection. For the sake of some inquirers we will reprint

as much of one of the articles of '49 as relates to this subject. We were speaking of "*The battle of that great day of God Almighty*," and of the parties engaged in it, *viz.*: "The beast, the false prophet, and the dragon." We had traced out the two first, and shown their fate to be entire destruction at the end of the present dispensation. We then proceeded as follows:—

Having thus briefly noticed the fate of some of the powers engaged in the battle of that day, we must not pass by an other power concerned in the same conflict. This is liable to be done by separating the 19th and 20th chapters, which should be regarded as inseparable. The *dragon* power is most assuredly engaged in that war, though not mentioned in chap. 19; yet the 16th chap. clearly shows the dragon as a principal actor in the scenes of that day. It was out of his mouth one of the unclean spirits came that was to gather to the battle. We may depend, therefore, that that power will not be overlooked. The account of the battle in Rev. 19th should be read to the close of the 3d verse of the 20th chap. without interruption; thus we shall get the fate of all the powers engaged in the conflict.

We are now, then, to inquire what power is symbolized by the *Dragon*; after which we will notice its fate. In introducing this power, chap. 20, it is called "The Dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan." The whole description here we consider symbolical; and not designed at all to represent a personal being usually denominated "*the devil*." This remark, however, is not to be construed into a denial of the existence of such a personal being: we only say, that in *this text* he is not the power spoken of. Dr. EADIE, in his Biblical Cyclopædia, a new English work on the word "*Dragon*," says: "In the Apocalypse it seems to be a symbol of the *dark, malignant spirit of Evil*, either in himself or in those human influences which he inspires or employs." On the "*serpent*," the same author remarks: "In Egypt and other nations the *serpent* was a common symbol of *power*. Idolaters regarded it as a *personification of all evil*." KITTO, in his "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," another English work of great merit and reputation, says: "They anciently represented all great destructive agents under the form of a *Dragon*, or *monster serpent*." He further remarks that there were temples built to Dragons, some of which were several miles in length, and built in a serpentine form.

As a sign of *power*, Moses seems to have used it when sent to Pharaoh: see Exodus 7: 9, where the Lord told Moses his rod should become a serpent—a *dragon*—before Pharoah. The word here translated serpent is the same that is rendered *dragon* Isa. 27: 1. It was the *sign* of Moses' *power*, received from God to deliver Israel. The words devil and satan are the Greek and Hebrew words expressing the same thing; and literally signify "*adversary*," leaving the connection to determine what particular adversary is spoken of. The expression, "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan," therefore, signifies *a dark, malignant power*, which is to act a prominent part in the transactions of "that great day of God Almighty;" and is not to be utterly destroyed at that time, but reserved for another period, hereafter to be spoken of. The question now returns—*What power is it?* We have said that the symbols by which it is represented only signify a malignant and destructive power. We now add, that we are not to suppose, because we find these symbols employed in regard to one destructive power, that that is the power always intended. If this were the case, we should have to confine its application wholly to the Imperial power of Egypt; for, in Ezekiel 29, the Lord expressly calls "Pharoah king of Egypt, the *great dragon*." This passage goes to confirm the position that it is a symbol to denote an extraordinary malignant or destructive power, and a power too that has specially been an oppressor of Jacob's posterity. Such was the Imperial power of Egypt; such was the Imperial power of Rome, and hence symbolized by a dragon, Rev. 12th; but in Rev. 16th and 20th we have come to a period where the symbol cannot apply to Rome Imperial, nor to Rome Papal; the latter is described by other symbols, and the former had passed away. The Dragon, then, in chapters 16 and 20 is another power. To find this power, we shall again have to revert to the prophecies of the Old Testament; we shall there find more in detail, a description of a part of this same battle of the great day of God. We turn then to Ezekiel 38 and 39. Let us examine some of the powers here introduced.

The 38th chapter commences thus—"Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of (*Rosh*) Mesheck and Tubal." We have inserted "*Rosh*" on the authority of the Septuagint. The 6th verse speaks of "Gomar, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the *north* quarters," &c. These powers are among those that are found in the conflict described in that prophecy. These are all descendants of Japheth, as may be learned from Genesis 10: 1—5. They peopled Asia Minor and nearly all *Europe*; called "The isle of the Gentiles," in the time of Moses: see Gen. 10: 5. "Gog." then, is to be found some where in Europe, and the Septuagint gives us the clue to the power intended, *viz.* "*Rosh*," or RUSSIA. Gog was in ancient times the name of *the king* of the northern country, as Pharoah was the common name of the kings of Egypt. Hence Gog is the name of a *Dynasty* of kings or emperors; and, if the Septuagint can be relied upon, it seems it is the Russian Dynasty. Russia has been a great oppressor of the Jews, and is still their greatest scourge; and, in this respect, is entitled to the appellation of "*the great Dragon*." Whether that power is literally to invade the land of Israel, as indicated

Ezk. 38 and 39, or whether the scenery is laid there only because the legal inheritors of that land are the subjects of Gog's malignant operations, we need not now decide—time will soon determine that point—but that Gog, the chief prince of Rosh, or Russia, is one of the most active and malignant powers engaged in the terrible conflict immediately to precede the establishment of the reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, is clearly evident. It is not our design now to give an exposition of this prophecy in Ezekiel, but only to introduce it so far as to identify the power with that denominated the Dragon, Rev. 16 and 20. In further confirmation of this view, we have in Rev. 20, the fact that when this power is loosed at the end of the 1000 years, the same powers are introduced into the scene as in Ezekiel, viz. "Gog and Magog." We are led, then, to the conclusion that the Dynasty of Russian Emperors is symbolized by "the Dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan." The Russian Imperial power began to assume its present importance and form under Peter the Great, in the commencement of the last century. It has steadily marched on to its present greatness, and its dark, malignant character; and most unquestionably has a part to act in the battle of the great day of God Almighty, which is not to be passed over under the general name of "the kings of the earth"—*tees gees*—of *the land*, or Roman Catholic earth, or territory where that Romish power had held sway. Russia is not, and never was, of that land; but is, and always has been, a separate and distinct power, and also is of the Greek religion, which is hostile to the Papal authority and religion. The difference between the two religious systems may be seen by consulting the "Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge," but we have not space to note it now.

If we are correct, then, in fixing upon the Russian imperial power as the Dragon power, we are now prepared to contemplate its fate. The other powers, let it be remembered, are utterly destroyed in the battle; and the symbols employed denote a destruction from which there is no revival—their destruction as organized powers is *final*. Not so with the Dragon power; and this forms a sufficient reason for introducing its fate in a distinct scene as found at the commencement of chap. 20. An angel is represented as coming down from heaven. By this expression, however, we are to understand nothing more than that the angel is a symbol of the agency that God shall choose to employ in accomplishing the work to be done. It is quite useless to speculate as to what agency precisely it is, that is symbolized by the angel, or that God will employ—time alone can certainly determine that. This power is represented as being commissioned to bind and imprison the dragon—that is, to cut off and curtail his power so that it can perform no organized work of evil for a specified period; but the dragon is not to be *destroyed* now as the other powers are; and it will have a revival, after which comes its final doom.

The work now to be accomplished is represented by symbols easy to be understood. The dragon is *bound*—*i. e.* deprived of all *his power*; then he is *shut up*; *i. e.* kept securely: in the "bottomless pit"—*abusson*. This Greek word occurs only twice out of Revelation, and seven times in that book. It may be proper here to inquire as to the meaning of it. One thing is certain, it never means *hell*, in the popular sense of that term. The first place where it occurs is in Luke 8: 31; and is there translated "*the deep*." Dr. Eadie, on this word, in his Cyclopædia, says—"Rendered in our version sometimes DEEP, and uniformly BOTTOMLESS PIT, either by itself or in connection with another term, in the book of Revelation. A deep without a bottom—a very deep pit, referring often to that vast body of water which in Jewish opinion was laid up in some cavernous receptacle within the earth. It refers sometimes to the dark sepulchres of the east, which, hewn out in the rock, and descending far beneath the surface, formed a kind of under world. In the Apocalypse, it symbolizes the abode and the doom of those powers which are hostile to Christ and his Church."

This definition may help us in further examining this point. In Rom. 10: 7, Paul uses the word thus, in speaking of our Lord—"Who shall descend into the deep"—*abusson*? "That is," says the apostle, "to bring up Christ again from *the dead*." Here the word is used for the sepulchre—the tomb—the state of the dead. The other places where it occurs are in Rev. 9: 1, 2, 11; and 11: 17; and 17: 8; and 20: 1, 2. In the last place, which we are at this time considering, it is used to indicate that as in a state of death a man is deprived of all power to accomplish anything, so the Dragon should be placed in such circumstances that he can accomplish nothing against those who had previously suffered from his malignity; and the world, under the reign of Christ and his associates in government, will remain unmolested till the end of the period specified; after which the Dragon power will revive for a short period, and then share the same fate that the beast and false prophet had done at the battle of the great day; which is symbolized by being cast into the lake of fire, and being tormented day and night for ever and ever; which language implies no more than the awful nature of the destruction of that power, and the perpetuity of its overthrow. Whether there be a personal devil, yea or nay, this text and context has nothing to do with his final destiny. It is an anti-Christian organism, national in its character, whose fate is here brought to view.

—

From the general view expressed in the foregoing article, we see no cause, as yet, to alter our mind, but much to confirm it. We are, however, now of opinion that the *Dragon* power

will be bound *before* the other powers, spoken of in the prophecy, are cast into the lake of fire. Our reasons for this are, first—Revelation 19th makes no mention of the Dragon power being in the battle with Him "on the white horse;" and Rev. 17th says, expressly, it is the scarlet colored beast, with his horns, that "shall make war with the Lamb."

"The battle of that great day of God," we are now inclined to think, will have *two* or more divisions. The first part of which will result in binding the Dragon and casting him into the bottomless pit, or abyss; after which may next follow that division of the battle which is with the Lamb, Rev. 17th and 19th chapters. Or, it may be that previous to the war with the Lamb, and after the binding of the Dragon, there will be a conflict between the agencies that bound the Dragon, resulting in some one of those agencies taking Jerusalem, or Palestine, and exalting itself there; the head of which to become the *Atheistical* "Anti-christ." We are of opinion that such an Anti-christ is to appear in Jerusalem, "exalting itself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped." That power, we think, will be at the head of the war against Him that sitteth on the white horse, Rev. 19th. But on that point we shall not dwell now: possibly we may say more hereafter. Our object now is to give our *opinion*, from present light, as to the probable period of the binding of the Dragon: not of the year, but of the order of time in the battle of the great day of God.

Our opinion is, that the first *great* event in the drama of that day will be, the overthrow, or breaking of the Russian Dynasty. Thus, in our first step, we differ from nearly all, if not of every one, of the writers on the subject. The general opinion of writers on prophecy is, that Russia is to be victorious in its present struggle with Turkey. We are, however, of a different opinion; and the view we take of prophecy compels us to the conclusion that though Russia may be in some respects victorious, for a time, yet, the result will be the *entire breaking* of the Russian power. Nothing is clearer than that this is not the period of that power's invasion of the land of Israel, spoken of in Ezekiel 38th. Whetner it be Israel literal or Israel spiritual that is to be there, when this northern power invades that land, it matters not as to the argument; for neither the one nor the other is there *now*: hence Russia's time for going there has not yet come; to our mind that point is settled.

Besides, the prophecy, Ezekiel 38th and 39th, clearly shows that in Gog's, or Russia's *first* attempt to go there God is "*against*" her, and declares He "will *put hooks into thy jaws*; and I will turn thee back, saith the Lord God." And again—"Behold I am against thee, O Gog * * and I will turn thee back, and leave but a sixth part of thee;" or, as the margin reads—"I will strike thee with six plagues; or draw thee back with a hook of six teeth:" showing when Russia shall stir up all her strength to come into Palestine, through Turkey, a *combination* of several powers—called a "hook of six teeth, or six plagues"—will fall upon her, and she will be driven back with a terrible overthrow; and this overthrow corresponds with the binding of the Dragon, Rev. 20. She goes into the *Abyss*; and a period of some length elapses before she recovers so as to have strength to come up against Palestine; and when she finally comes there the "*people* gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods" will be "dwelling in the midst of the land:" and that people is "My people of Israel" "saith the Lord God;" and let him say otherwise who dares, we dare not.

Whatever may be said of the fall of Turkey, or the Ottoman empire, we are satisfied that power is not the Euphrates of Rev. 16th, which the sixth vial is to dry up. Our reasons for abandoning that interpretation we gave in part, in the Examiner for August last. In addition to those reasons we now add another still more conclusive, that is—"The battle of the great day" does not commence till *after* the symbolical great river Euphrates is "dried up." *That* is first done, and this *prepares* "the way of the kings of the east."

The great question, now to be settled, is, every where, called, "*The Eastern Question.*" The kings of the east, or "kings of the earth" (Rev. 16: 14), move not to the battle of that great day till the way is "prepared." The great river Euphrates, or "the water thereof," *is* dried up just as certain as the battle of the great day of God is at hand. The water is not dried up *in* that battle; but *before* it commences.

The *waters* on which Mystical Babylon, Rev. 17th, sat are expressly said to be "*peoples*," &c. Literal Babylon sat on literal Euphrates. Mystical Babylon sat on mystical Euphrates. Babylon literal did not fall till the literal Euphrates was dried up, or turned away from being its defence. Babylon mystical does not fall till the *water* of mystical Euphrates is dried up. Those waters are *the people* of Italy, especially; who had sustained her. Those waters have been dried up since '48. The people have left her to her fate; and she is now on "the scarlet colored beast," till "the hour of her judgment" is fully come; then "her flesh" will be "eat," and she "burned with fire."

Whatever may be the ultimate fate of Turkey, we are quite sure the interpretation that makes it the mystical Euphrates is an error. Whether the views we have suggested are true or not time will soon determine; and it alters not our mind because some may cry out, "inconsistency." Some people are quite *consistent* in never confessing themselves wrong, tho' they may have *changed* as many times as their neighbors.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW-YORK, MARCH 1, 1854.

IMMORTAL-SOULISM.—"Saunder's Fifth Reader" is among the books used in our common schools. In the 114th *Lesson*, "*Life and Death Contrasted*," are the following sentiments:

"*Life* is much flattered, death traduced:
Compare the rivals, and *the kinder* crown.
Life makes the soul dependent on the dust,
Death gives her wings to mount above the spheres.
Is not the mighty mind, that sun of heaven!
By *tyrant life* dethroned, imprisoned, chained?
By death enlarged, ennobled, deified?
Death is the crown of life!
Were death denied poor man would live in vain,—
Were death denied even fools would wish to die.
Death wounds to cure;—we fall,—we rise,—we reign!
Spring from our fetters, fasten in the skies,
Where blooming Eden withers in our sight.
Death gives us more than was in Eden lost;—
This king of terrors is the prince of peace."

Such blasphemy as this is worthy of the source from whence it emanates. The notion of an immortal soul in man begat and nourishes this robbery of God and his Christ. If "death is the crown of life," who puts it on our head? Answer—"*The Devil;*" for he "had the power of death:" Heb. 2: 14. And as Christ is to "destroy death and him who had the power of it," (Heb 2: 14,) it follows that Christ is to destroy "the crown of life!" But Jesus saith, "I will give thee a crown of life." But this immortal-soul theory saith, "Were death denied, poor man would live in vain!" Did Enoch and Elijah "live in vain" who were "translated that they should not see death?" Did they miss "the crown of life!" Will all such as "are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord," who are then to be "changed in a moment" to "immortality," and so not die, miss "the crown of life?" Have they lived "in vain?" Strange havoc does this theory make of the truth of God. But death is made the great Physician—"Death wounds to *cure!*" Death then is the healer, and the devil brings the medicine! Here is robbery of Christ and blasphemy against him! Next, "life" is blasphemed. How so? "*Life* makes the soul dependent on the dust—death gives her wings to mount above the spheres." Thus life is condemned and death glorified!

Moses saith, "I set before you life and death—choose life, that thou mayst live." But Moses, didst thou not know life makes the soul dependent on the dust, while death gives it wings? Surely, Moses, death is by far the most desirable!

The next point in this blasphemy is, that "Death gives us more than was in Eden lost." Now, God gave Eden, with life and all its joys and pleasures; but informed man that he should lose it all, as a punishment, if he sinned. But Satan (*alias* immortal-soulism,) true to his original text—"thou shalt not surely die"—still affirms the soul gains by sin; and that the death threatened brings more to man than he lost in Eden! Thus death was a blessing, and exclusion from the tree of life a reward to be coveted, as death is to give *more* than was in Eden lost!

But the blasphemy stops not here. It puts death in the place of Christ, and openly steals the peculiar title of the Son of God. Death, saith immortal-soulism, "is the *Prince of Peace!*" Truly, this blasphemous railer could go no higher. Christ came to "*destroy* death"—i. e., to destroy "the Prince of Peace." The last enemy to be destroyed is death, (1 Corth. 15: 26,) but then, according to this blasphemy, the Prince of Peace is destroyed!

If such doctrine is not putting darkness for light, and calling light darkness—if it is not calling evil good and good evil, then we may defy language to tell us what is. But it is the natural and legitimate fruit of the doctrine of an immortal soul in man. The resurrection is of no use—is a fable—and would be a positive evil according to the sentiments here commented on. Yes, according to this theory, the work of Christ, to raise the dead and give life again, is all an evil work; and the whole scheme of redemption, or deliverance from death and corruption, is a work utterly useless and pernicious. Alas, for a theory which contemns God—deifies death, and exalts the devil, who had the power of it. Truly, immortal-soulism stands out in its genuine character as a robber of God and his Christ—as the betrayer and murderer of the Son of God, and showing its paternity—i. e., that it is of its father the devil. The only testimony in favor of the *natural* immortality of man, in the Bible, is in Gen. 3: 4, "*Ye shall not surely die.*" If that testimony is good and true, then is that theory true, and this school book tells the truth, and all the blasphemous as-

sumptions therein containe
against all the claims of J
demption by him.

Our heart sickens within
template the fatal and dest
mortal-soulism, and trace
sequences. We believe m
entangled in its meshes, an
selves to think of the poss
be in error. Time-hono
charms to them than ca
contemned truth. They f
face, lest they may be dec
sympathize with them
hope they will yet see, tha
men is the way to shut ou
their hearts. "How can
honor one of another?
Saviour; and it is just as
as in the day he uttered it.

Shall such blasphemy,
mented on, be taught to
common schools? Are th
to be taught to despise *lif*
and to praise *death*, the c
distinction between sin an
ished in their youthful
taught that death is "*kin*
best of the two? So tha
of sin" which "is death,"
sired, and more valuable
shall such slander of our
our public schools?

A THEOLOGIC

AN EXAMINATION E

It is said—"*The soul*
immaterial, uncompound
structible, and hence imm

Here is surely an array
deter a timid man from in
lowing the apostolical inju
prove, or examine, these a

1. How do those who ta
the soul is a simple essenc
a simple essence? can the
merely a phrase to blind t
investigation? Surely th
cates no idea to the mi
vague to give any instructi
to admit of being the sub
therefore it must pass for a
tion.

sumptions therein contained must stand as truth against all the claims of Jesus Christ, and redemption by him.

Our heart sickens within us whenever we contemplate the fatal and destroying delusion of immortal-soulism, and trace out its legitimate consequences. We believe many sincere souls are entangled in its meshes, and fear to allow themselves to think of the possibility that they may be in error. Time-honored error has more charms to them than care-worn, slighted and contemned truth. They fear to look truth in the face, lest they may be deceived by her. We can sympathize with them in some degree; but hope they will yet see, that to receive honor of men is the way to shut out truth and faith from their hearts. "How can ye believe that receive honor one of another?" said the beloved Saviour; and it is just as solemn a truth now as in the day he uttered it.

Shall such blasphemy, as that we have commented on, be taught to your children in our common schools? Are they, thus early in life, to be taught to despise *life*—the gift of God—and to praise *death*, the curse for sin? Is all distinction between sin and holiness to be abolished in their youthful minds, and they be taught that death is "*kinder*" than life? the best of the two? So that in fact, "the wages of sin" which "is death," are more to be desired, and more valuable than life? We ask, shall such slander of our Creator be tolerated in our public schools?

A THEOLOGICAL SOUL:

An Examination By the Editor.

It is said—"*The soul is a simple essence, immaterial, uncompounded, indivisible, indestructible, and hence immortal.*"

Here is surely an array of words that might deter a timid man from investigation; but, following the apostolical injunction, we proceed to *prove*, or examine, these assumptions.

1. How do those who take this position know the soul is a simple essence? Again, What is a simple essence? can they tell us? Or, is it merely a phrase to blind the mind and hinder investigation? Surely the phrase communicates no idea to the mind of man—it is too vague to give any instruction—it is too subtile to admit of being the subject of thought, and therefore it must pass for an unfounded assumption.

2. What is *immateriality*? Strictly speaking it is, *not material*—not matter. In other words—it is *not substance*. What is that which has no substance? What kind of *creation* is it? If the Creator formed "all things out of nothing," it would seem that man's soul has taken the form of its original, and is *nothing* still; for it is *not matter*, we are told. If it is said—"It is a spiritual substance"—we ask, What kind of substance is that, if it is not matter? We cannot conceive, and we do not see how it is possible to conceive, of substance without matter, in some form: it may be exceedingly refined. We regard the phrase, immaterial, as one which properly belongs to the things which *are not*: a sound without sense or meaning: a mere cloak to hide the nakedness of the theory of an immortal soul in man; a phrase of which its authors are as profoundly ignorant as the most unlearned of their pupils.

3. It is said—"*The soul is uncompounded.*" If that is true, then it follows that it is *uncreated*. We can form no idea of a creation without compounding. If not compounded it is only what it was: no new idea is produced. Then if the soul exists at all, as an entity, it must be a part of the uncreated: that is, it must be a part of God. If a part of God, how can it sin? Can God be divided against himself? But how is that God who is "without body or *parts*" to be separated into the millions of souls that have inhabited, and do inhabit this earth? And then these parts of God often meet in the battle field, slaying each other! Horrid work, truly, for parts of God to be engaged in! But we cannot stop here. Millions of these parts of God sin against other parts of God, and are sent to hell to be tormented eternally, and eternally to curse and blaspheme the other parts of God! Such is the inevitable result of the theory we oppose, disguise it as its advocates may.

4. "The soul is *indivisible*," it is affirmed. Then, if a part of God, it is an undivided part of God; and there is not, and cannot be, in the nature of the case, but *one* soul to the whole human family. If the soul is *indivisible*, how could Abraham give or communicate a soul to Isaac? It could not be an offshoot from his own, for that would make his soul *divisible*, and our opposers say it is "indivisible." We cannot see, if Abraham communicated Isaac's soul to him, but what it must still have been Abraham's soul in Isaac, if the soul is not divisible; and then

we do not see how there can be more than *one* soul for the whole human family; and as that is "indivisible," it is a *family* soul; hence it follows that the action of any one man must be the action of the *family* soul; so if one man sins, it is a *family* sin, or if one man acts virtuously it is a *family* virtue. Again, as the soul is "indivisible," all men must have the same common destiny: say, for example, if Abraham should be lost, Isaac must be lost, for the soul can't be divided! and so whatever is the fate of the first man, Adam, must be the fate of all the men of his race, or else the soul must be divisible; and then, what would become of the theory of its indivisibility? Happy for man, however, we have the assurance that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are saved, and that proves Adam and Eve were, and that all their posterity must inevitably be so too—for "*the soul is indivisible.*" Thus our opposers take a short and certain rout to universal salvation. Can they get out of that dilemma without abandoning their theory?

There is no avoiding these conclusions only by affirming that a soul is created for each newborn child. But if created, is it holy or unholy? If holy, does God place holy souls in unholy bodies to pollute and defile them? If souls are a new creation at birth, how is Adam's moral depravity transmitted to his posterity? as theologians affirm it is. But if they are created unholy, is any soul of man blameworthy for their moral depravity? These are questions for the theologians to solve who maintain the indivisibility of the soul: questions which are no longer to pass by any man's mere *affirmation.* Give us proof—"thus saith the Lord," for these assumptions about the soul.

5. Shall it be affirmed the soul is "*indestructible*?" If so, it is because God has determined it shall not be destroyed, or because he lacks power to destroy it. If it is the first, give us Scripture testimony of such determination. We hesitate not to say, there is no "thus saith the Lord" for any such assumption. If it is said, God cannot destroy it—We ask did he create it? If so, does it take a greater exertion of power to destroy than to create? or, did God so exhaust his omnipotence in the act of creation that it is not now equal to the work of reducing back to its original state that which he has made? If we were to affirm God's *inability* to destroy anything he has created we might justly be charged with being "*infidel.*" As it is, our opposers might more justly be charged with atheism; for they, in fact, deny Jehovah's omnipotence, which is equivalent to a denial of his being.

If to make their assumptions stronger they use the term annihilate, and say, "nothing can be annihilated—therefore man cannot be;" we answer, this position is wholly untenable, and is a deceptive play upon words. If a man dash in pieces a bottle, or burn a house to ashes, or consume a lamb in the fire, are not the bottle, the house, the lamb, annihilated? Say not, the elements of which they consisted still exist: *they*—the bottle, the house, the lamb—do not exist, *as such:* that *form* is annihilated. So when man ceases to exist, *as man*, he is annihilated. Not the elements of which he was formed: but as man he is no more. On the subject of annihilation, however, we may speak more at large in another place: we will only add now—If "God created all things out of nothing," as the theology of the age affirms, then he can, if he will, reduce all things back to nothing, or omnipotence has ceased to be omnipotent.

The attempt to prove the immortality of the soul, from its supposed indestructibility, is without force or truth; and with it falls the whole catalogue of assumptions, with which it is connected. He who created can destroy—"Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell"—in *gehenna.*

The Philosophical argument for the immortality of man's soul, when stript of all its useless attire, stands thus:—

1. *There are only two primary substances, viz: matter and spirit.*

2. *Matter has no power of self-motion, or self-determination, however it may be organized.*

3. *Therefore, wherever we see matter endowed with this power, there must have been added to it an immortal spirit or soul, that is immaterial, &c.*

This is the soul of all the philosophical arguments that have ever been put forth to prove man has an immortal soul. If the position is true it endows every animal, insect, or crawling worm upon earth with an immortal and immaterial soul just as *really* as man; and strips Jesus Christ of all the glory of bestowing immortality upon man by his work and mediation.

PROFESSOR MAURICE ONCE MORE.—We expressed the hope, in our last, that we should be able to get a more definite view of this gentleman's position; and, possibly, the following editorial remarks, by Br. Ham, in his *Christian Examiner*, may throw some light on the subject. Br. Ham speaks as follows:

The indictment against Mr. Maurice rests on his denial of the popular dogma of future punishment, as an eternity of irretrievable misery, but he is obnoxious to his sectarian superiors for other doctrinal reasons, as for example, his symbolizing with the Unitarian apprehension of the Christian Atonement, to which we referred in our last, and further, for espousing those views of the natural constitution of man as a being not inherently or by constitution immortal, which we have been laboring to advocate, and we rejoice to see has gained the earnest and conscientious advocacy of so popular and influential a writer and preacher as Professor Maurice. His doctrinal departure from *popular* orthodoxy is thus very considerable,—indeed, Mr. Maurice, with a slight variation on the subject of Future Punishment, occupies the same theological stand-point as ourselves. He claims to represent a true orthodoxy, of which, he maintains the recognized creeds of the Church of England are the plain exponents. That the three English creeds will very largely justify Mr. Maurice's exposition of them, a contributor to our pages has very satisfactorily shown. Still Mr. Maurice must know, that if he can cite authorities from the doctrinal formularies of his Church, others can bring counter authorities from the same formularies, and his opponents occupy as strong ground as himself. He cannot be ignorant that the doctrinal *dicta* of the Church of England are various and conflicting, and that those who differ most widely from him, can find shelter under its broad wing as well as he. We respectfully submit to him whether it would not be more honorable, and safer, to candidly acknowledge the compost of heterogeneous doctrines advocated by the Church of England, and setting its formularies aside as authorities in the high matter of Christian doctrine, appeal, as we believe he may, most powerfully to "the law and the testimony" in support of the chief doctrines he advocates. If his wish be to maintain his status as a clergyman in the Church of England, the course he is pursuing is most undoubtedly the proper one; but if it be to use his wide-spread influence in vindication of unpopular doctrines of Scripture, then should he, we think, pay that supreme deference to Scripture which he professes to acknowledge, and discarding merely human and conflicting formularies of faith, which will give their sanction equally to error and truth, defer to *it* as the sole arbiter in all that concerns Christian faith and practice. It is a sad inconsistency in those who regard the Bible as the doctrinal text-book, to transfer its authority to the Prayer Book. "Churchmen" may look with complacency on such a derogation from the dignity of the Bible; but Christians, and all earnest truth-seeking men, must deprecate and deplore it. As to what the Prayer Book teaches is of very partial importance, but what the Bible discloses to our understanding and faith, is of universal moment. We do entreat the Professor, therefore, to make these grand discussions *Bible* questions, and if he must take up his cross in doing so, he will bear it in a goodly cause, and may, peradventure, be the instrument of a broad and blessed reformation.

We complained, in our former notice of Professor Maurice's theological opinions, of a want of conspicuousness, and, we write it with much regret, of an absence of candor. These drawbacks are less conspicuous in the Essay* now under review, than in some others; still, even the present essay is not altogether free from these serious faults. The inquiry presented in this Essay concerns the meaning of the following words in the Apostle's Creed: "He was dead and buried. He descended into Hell, the third day He rose again from the dead."

"I wish to inquire," writes Mr. Maurice, "whether the spiritual men, or these words of the creed, meet the demands of the human heart best, whether these words, or those who cast them aside, are most favorers of superstition." p. 151.

The "spiritual men" referred to by Mr. Maurice, are they, we presume, who are fond of the spiritual or non-natural acceptation of plain words, and through whom these words of the creed have got a singularly vague sense attached to them. We rejoice to see our author join issue with these theological libertines, by whose licentious handling of the word of God it is so often made "of none effect." Their dreamy and illogical interpretations have done an incalculable amount of mischief to the profession of an intelligent Christianity. Let not our readers mistake Mr. Maurice. He means not by "spiritual men" those only who, after the Swedenborgian type, convert our plain Saxon into the most perplexing signs of an equally perplexing religious super-sensualism,—he includes also, those mischievous meddlers with their mother-tongue, who force plain and palpable words to a service in Scripture which they have not in ordinary parlance. The language of theology needs a careful and candid revisal, and must have it before we can hope to see religious discussions either intelligibly or satisfactorily prosecuted.

We must pass over the introductory portions of the Essay, although, had our space afforded, we should have been glad to call our readers' attention to Mr. Maurice's admirable remarks on Strauss's antithesis to Paul's memorable saying—"the last enemy which shall be destroyed is *Death;*" in which he justifies the apparently "audacious paradox" of the German

* Essay VIII. The Resurrection of the Son of God from the Dead, the Grave, and Hell.

theologian, and shows how much the orthodox theology has had to do in making the large mass of men "practically yield assent to the proposition that,—the last enemy which shall be destroyed is the belief of man in his own immortality."

This much we must transcribe;—

"Surely the modern teacher has a large body of unconfessing, unconscious disciples; he must have known that he was the spokesman for thousands, whom some fear withheld from expressing their own feelings. And have I not been obliged to confess in former essays, that there is a justification for these feelings? Cannot numbers tell of sad effects which the dread of the world to come has produced upon their conduct to other men, upon their judgment of the beautiful world in which God has placed them, upon their thoughts of God Himself? Have they not been cold, harsh, selfish, whenever their minds have been occupied with the one problem, how they may avert the doom which they fear is awaiting them hereafter? Have they not almost cursed the trees and flowers, the new birth of spring, the songs of birds, the faces of children, as if they were mockeries—witnesses of some present life with which they cannot safely sympathise? Has not the vision of God been one of darkness and horror? When they have said, 'Our Father,' have they not intended one who might destroy them, and from whom they have wished to be delivered? Such experiences in themselves, interpret what they read in history. They see what frightful crimes have been committed by men for the sake of pleasing or appeasing those who may dispose of their future destiny; how these crimes have become a part of their moral system, sanctioned and promoted by those who had apparently more insight into the mind of their God or gods than they have; what poverty and filth, what neglect of relations, what slavery and cowardice have been engendered by the notion that the business of existence here, is to provide for the possibilities of another.

Tantum Relligio potuit suadere malorum

has been no unreasonable summary of this evidence. Is not this summary expressed in another form by the words: 'The enemy to be got rid of, is the sense of immortality?' " pp. 152—154.

The popular theology has thus perpetrated a double wrong. It has first of all endorsed and re-presented the celebrated arch-deception—"Ye shall *not* surely die . . . . ye shall be as gods;" and then it has drawn such a picture of the future life, and of the character and purposes of God, that the bare possibility of being found among the condemned hereafter, and spending this deathlessness in inconceivable and ever augmenting miseries, makes the life-loving heart of man secretly, but no less surely, deny its own powerful instincts, and wish there were no immortality. Mr. Maurice wisely dares to utter this, and in doing so, he is a true benefactor of his race, and rendering an acceptable service to God.

But we must hasten to discover the doctrine of this essay, as that is our chief purpose in calling attention to it in our pages, and are therefore constrained to pass by much well worthy of reflection, especially some very appropriate remarks on the confidence and comfort which dying saints enjoy from the thought that Christ too has died, and known the experience which his suffering followers, have to know in the hour of mortality. The first indication of our author's doctrine of death is presented in the following words, where he clearly identifies the human personality, not with any disembodied existence, but the corporeal form which lies stretched on the bed of death a lifeless corpse.

"'He is gone,' are the words by which those who are standing round by a bed-side, declare that the person whom they knew, is not in the form they look upon. But that form is sacred, and awful. It is the witness and pledge that he has been. They cannot look upon it in its stillness and repose, and *satisfy themselves with any thoughts of a disembodied spirit. In some way or other, they must connect it with the friend who spoke with them, and cared for them . . . . . The body associates itself with any thoughts we have of personality and immortality.*" pp. 158, 159.

But the following remarks are more definite and to the point:—

"We speak continually of death as the separation of the soul from the body. If we try to give ourselves an account of what we mean by Soul and Body, we should say, I suppose, roughly, that the soul is that with which we think; the body that which moves from place to place, and to which certain organs of sense belong. If this be so, how little does our language correspond to the fact which it tries to describe! Death, so far as we can judge from any of the phenomena it presents to us, *affects the powers of thinking, of motion, of sensation, equally;* our *natural* impression would be, that *whatever influence it produced on one, it produces also on the other.* But that strange 'sense of immortality' which the benevolent German is so eager to extinguish, *would not allow people to follow this conclusion of nature; something*, they said, must survive. The soul would go to Hades; the hero himself would be a prey to the birds and dogs. We have adopted the language very nearly; often we adopt it altogether, even though we have a confused impression that the soul has more to do with the hero himself, and the body with that which the dogs or birds devour. But when *that* conviction has thoroughly taken possession of a man, when his 'sense of immortality' has begun to express itself in the only language which can express it, and he says, '*I* shall survive, *I* cannot perish!' then, first, all that horror which Strauss would deliver us from, is awakened; then, secondly, it becomes impossible for the

man to divide his soul from that which has been, during all his experience of it, its yoke-fellow. If he has cultivated his powers of reflection, and has studied the forms of language, he may learn gradually to find that the names which have stood so distinct in men's discourses, have distinct realities answering to them. But he will not allow his imperfect psychology to interfere with the witness of his conscience—that he, who uses equally the powers of thought and the powers of motion and sensation which have been entrusted to him, is responsible for both;—that, however they may be divided or united, *they are both intimately attached to his personality.*

"If, then, there comes upon him a much stronger sense of his connexion with deeds done in the body than he had while he was drawing those artificial lines, and also a much stronger conviction of the dignity and sacredness of the body than those who would separate it from the soul can entertain, the marvel of death—which seems to extinguish soul as well as body, and yet which he can neither hope nor fear will extinguish *him*—presents itself under a new aspect. He *must* have a solution of it. The solution must be one which does not hide any part of the fact, which does not impose a notion upon him as a substitute for the fact. The Scripture says plainly, that *Christ poured out His soul*, as well as His body, to death. The description of His agony and crucifixion has been received by those who have believed it, practically, if not in name, as the history of *the death of a soul* as well as of a body. Those who have wished to represent His death as different from all others, for the sake of enhancing its worth, have dwelt upon this as its most wonderful characteristic. To me it seems the most wonderful, because from it I am able to learn what other deaths are,—*what the death of man is.* Christ gave up all that was His own,—He gave Himself to His Father. He disclaimed any life which did not belong to Him in virtue of His union with the Eternal God. It is our privilege to disclaim any life which does not belong to us in virtue of our union with him. This would be an obvious truth, if we were indeed created and constituted in Him,—if He was the root of our humanity. We should not then have any occasion to ask how much perishes or survives in the hour of death. We should assume that *all must perish, to the end that all may survive.*"

The italicised passages deserve the reader's attention, as in them particularly Mr. Maurice plainly enunciates his opinions. The following propositions are very distinctly affirmed by our author:—

1. That, judging from the phenomena of death, death effects equally the *thinking* powers, and those of motion and sensation;—that is, it destroys the conscious being man.

2. That the union of body and soul, or the material organism, and its phenomena of thinking, feeling, and motion, constitute *one undivided personality*, or man.

3. That *Christ's* death comprehended all that pertained to his conscious manhood:—that is, that it was *a complete cessation of his personal existence.*

4. That man perishes *entirely* in death, and is revived *entirely* in the resurrection from the dead.

More about the Dragon.—Since our article, in another part of the Examiner, was in type, new arrivals have brought further news from Europe, which goes to strengthen the view we have advanced.

The following is from an editorial article in the New-York Herald, of Feb. 21, immediately after the arrival of the Baltic. We give it place as an indication of the feeling that seems to pervade many minds, that the Russian power ought to be stayed in its insane course; and somehow confined. We think it is destined to be "*bound* and cast into the bottomless pit;" being quite confident it is the "*Devil-Dragon*" power of Rev. 16th and 20th. The Herald says:—

On the 6th, in reply to interpellations put to him by the Marquis of Clanricade, Lord Clarendon stated in the House of Lords that the proposals, or rather "the counter project," presented to the court of Vienna on the part of the Emperor of Russia, through the medium of Count Orloff, had been formally rejected by the representatives of the Four Powers, and that there was no reason to suppose that fresh negotiations would be renewed. The details of this project, as given in the ministerial organ, the London *Times*, surpass in extravagance the previous ideas that had been formed of their character. They would almost go to establish the truth of the information conveyed, a short time since in the St. Petersburgh correspondence of one of the London papers, that the Czar was becoming crazy under the combined influence of ambition and fanaticism, and that he believed himself inspired with a divine mission, in which he might safely undertake a crusade against all the nations of the world. It is difficult to account for the audacity and insolence that characterise this project by any other hypothesis short of hopeless insanity, for it not only renews in stronger terms than ever, all his original demands upon Turkey, but it seeks to reduce the German Powers to a condition of subjection to his will little short of vassalage. Had he been trying to devise one proceeding more likely than another to wound the pride and arouse the independent feelings of the governments to which it was addressed, he could not have hit upon a happier expedient. It is fortunate for the interests of humanity, that God, in endowing him with ambition, has denied him reason and judgment, for with these attributes combined he would have been the scourge and terror of the human race.

The decisive attitude which these arrogant pretentions have at length determined the governments of Austria and Prussia to assume, removes all grounds for serious apprehensions as to the peace of Europe being for any length of time seriously compromised by this modern Tamerlane. Immense as are his resources, they will be found scarcely adequate to protect his own frontiers against the hosts of enemies that his insane ambition is conjuring up. Between the Turks and Circassians in the South, the Austrians and Prussians in the West, and the allied fleets menacing his coasts both in the Baltic and the Black Seas, he will find sufficient to occupy his attention without dreaming of further projects of aggression. *Caged like some ferocious beast in his den*, he may beat against the bars that hem him in; but he will be no longer in a position to inspire apprehension. As his safe-keeping may, however, prove costly, some other means must be resorted to to render him *for the future impotent and harmless.*

The gigantic strides which the Power of Russia has been making for the last century and a half, and the projects of conquest and aggrandisement which she has developed in her encroachments upon the Turkish Empire, have long occupied the attention of European statesmen, and aroused them to the necessity of opposing. The spirit of the age and the interests of humanity demand that some effectual restraints shall be imposed upon dangerous ambitions like his.

"THE WHOLE TRUTH."

BY ELD. J. S. WHITE.

We have, of late, frequently seen it more than intimated, that those who devote their time in preaching the doctrine of immortality through Christ, do not preach the "whole truth." I do not remember that I have seen it stated, what truth we should preach, which lies outside of this. If immortality, or eternal life through Christ, does not include the whole truth, contained in the gospel, which was to be preached in all the world, and which was in the commission of our Lord to his disciples, then I would be informed of that truth which is distinct and separate from future life only through Jesus Christ. If we speak of repentance it is with its necessary reference to life in Christ as the result. It is the same with the hope of the gospel, and the faith of the gospel; and also of every practical duty and condition required of man.

If in the "age to come," as it is called, men are to be saved on any condition not contained in the gospel, and through any other medium save Christ, we must wait for a revelation of the fact; for there is no other name given under heaven, among men, by which we must be saved, save the name of Jesus Christ. Christ "abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Life and immortality, then, through Jesus Christ, is, I conceive, the central point of the whole truth, and cannot be fully presented without bringing out every branch of truth contained in the gospel, which was to be preached even to the end of the world. I am fully persuaded that in presenting this subject fully, I am preaching the "whole truth." If there be a point contained in this subject which I do not yet see, it nevertheless belongs to the subject, but it follows, that if this subject be *fully* presented that point will be seen and preached.

The more I contemplate this great subject, the more does my soul magnify the grace of God "which is to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

From Thomas Garbutt.

Orangeport, N. Y., Feb. 2, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—January is out; another month's labor is finished. The blessed Lord has spared my life and comforted my heart. I have seen good done in his name. I have labored in Lyndon, Somerset, and Lewiston. In the latter place, the last week, with the Christian Church. Elder Pearce is their pastor; a faithful man and a Bible student. He is with us in faith. We have had a good time: several backsliders are reclaimed, and three, we trust, converted "to God and the word of his grace." The Lord is with us; and my prayer is, that many more may be added to the Church. I feel encouraged and determined to be faithful. I hope my brethren will be steadfast, and work more to save sinners. Yours, in hope of Immortality.

From Thomas Read.

Br. Storrs:—I trust Br. Marsh will not move you from your position respecting the giving a decided prominence to the *Life Theme.* I am thoroughly persuaded that *that* is the lever that will enable us most effectually to overturn the prevailing errors of the day. Not that other truths are of much less importance, but almost every truth has been already tried and has failed. Failed, perhaps, in consequence of being mixed with error; yet, nevertheless, having once failed, though now we have these other truths in greater purity, we cannot use them as the opening wedge; but, the Life theme, once received, effectually removes early prejudices and induces investigation of the other truths.

Let Br. Marsh and his coadjutors pursue their own course, while we bid them God speed in good faith. I like the Bible Examiner because the Life theme holds the conspicuous place; and I take the Harbinger because I find therein other truths.

Br. C. F. Sweet writes from *Ulster*, Pa., the last of January, that he has spent several weeks in that county, and preached in eight dif-

ferent towns; in some of which he has had a good hearing; and that much thought on Life and Death has been the result of his labors; he expects to see some fruit. The region of country where he had been laboring was rather hard to cultivate in pecuniary matters; tho' it will be seen, by the Report of the Prov. Com., that he has collected something. May the friends of truth, everywhere see and feel the importance of sustaining those men of God who are giving their time to proclaim the truth to dying men.

Since the foregoing was prepared for the press, we have received the following from Br. Sweet under date Feb. 14th. He says:—

Since I last wrote. I have spent some two weeks and over in Lycoming county, Pa. I have never been doing as much for the cause of truth as since I saw you in Dansville (last October). I do not try to please men lest I should not be the servant of Christ. A good work is begun in this section, and it will go forward, I trust, notwithstanding all opposition.

EXTRACTS.

May God grant to my sons if they live to manhood, an unshaken love of truth, and a firm resolution to follow it for themselves, with an intense abhorrence of all party ties, save that one tie which binds them to the party of Christ against wickednesss—*Dr. Arnold.*

The true and grand idea of the Church, that is, a society for the purpose of making men like Christ, earth like heaven, the kingdom of this world the kingdom of Christ, is all lost, and men look upon it as an institution for religious worship, and religious instruction, thus robbing it of its life and universality, making it an affair of clergy, not of people, of preaching and ceremonies, not of living, of Sundays and synagogues, instead of one of all days, and all places, houses, streets, town and country.—*Idem.*

Piety has a transmuting power, and often turns the inconsistency of the understanding into food for the heart. Therefore instead of murmuring we should rejoice, when we see the same Christian holiness manifested under diverse opinions. For Christianity embraced under one form, might have been rejected under another. All cannot see through the same telescope, but different eyes require the tube to be variously adjusted. And the image formed will be at best blurred and dim, unless Charity furnish us with her achromatic lens, and blend all the rays into one harmonious brightness.—*Edinburgh Review.*

He who would trust implicity, must inquire conscientiously. True faith sould rest on sound knowledge.

A really good thing may stand at the door of our judgment, asking admittance, dressed in the rags of a very bad name.

☞ PICK'S CONCORDANCE is on the Old Testament *only.*

☞ WE have received the *Christian Examiner*, and also the *Expositor of Life and Immortality* for February. The Christian Examiner has been enlarged to 36 pages.

W. MORRIS.—Your letter and the two pamphlets were duly received some days since. Thank you for them, and will write you soon if possible. Let us hear from you again. We have often thought of you, and should have sent the Examiner if we had known where you resided.

TOBACCO.—We have received three "Prize Essays," on this abominable weed, from "*Fowler & Wells*, 131 Nassau St., New York." The Titles of these Essays are:—

"TOBACCO: its History, Nature, and effects: with facts and figures for tobacco-users."

"EVILS OF TOBACCO, as they affect body, mind, and morals."

"TOBACCO DISEASES: with a remedy for the habit."

Though we have not had time to examine these Essays, we dare say they are good. How any sane man can use the *filthy* weed we have never been able to comprehend. A more offensive habit we can scarcely conceive of. The late Bishop Roberts, of the Methodist E. Church, once said, in General Conference, "There are but *two animals* that will eat tobacco, *viz.:* The Tobacco worm and the *filthy* wild goat of Africa." We always remembered that remark, and regret to see men debase themselves to the level of those animals. If they have any regard to *purity*, let them quit the filthy practice.

THE PROVISIONARY COMMITTEE.—It is now just one year since this *Com.* came together, and associated on the *only* principle, as we then believed, and still believe, on which persons differing widely on many topics, yet *agreeing* on the grand doctrine of "*Life and Immortality only through Jesus Christ*," could be associated for action. Many approved our association; but some took another course, to their own liking, which we could not but regard as sectarian in character; yet it is likely that no organization can be formed but that its tendency is to exclusiveness and sectarianism. With this conviction, it was with some reluctance we, at first, formed the *Prov. Com.*; but something more efficient

seemed necessary to put forward the grand truth in which many were united. The experiment, however, has satisfied us that *individual* responsibility and action is the true ground to be occupied. The preacher who cannot secure from those among whom he labors, or friends elsewhere, a competency for himself and family, has good reason to think that he is called to "Tent making," or some other honest calling for a livelihood; and any *Com.* or *Society* is liable to be partial, however well they may intend to do. Preachers who ought to be helped or brought into the field, may often be overlooked, and crowded from the field, most proper for them, by others who are sent into it by those organized bodies. After one year's experience, we are satisfied if the work cannot be done by *individual labor*, and individual *responsibility*, it cannot be done at all without engendering strife, in which *we will not be partners.* We have determined, therefore, to *disband* our organization, and no longer to be known as a *Prov. Com.*, while, we doubt not, *individually*, we shall do as much, and likely more, than heretofore. We have no idea of abandoning the *Life Theme*, but shall labor to spread abroad the truth, as we understand it, with unabated zeal; and we hope every lover of the truth will bestow his labor and his funds in those places, where he believes God and duty calls.

Those who have subscribed to aid the Prov. Com., we suppose will be disposed to pay in the amount; but in doing so, let them state *definitely* to what preacher it shall be applied: or if they prefer it should be appropriated to scatter publications, on the *Life Theme*, tell us what publications, and where they shall be scattered.

The agents who have acted under the *Prov. Com.*, we intend to pay up to this date, if the funds are received. We have endeavored to do all our work so that we could openly proclaim to the contributors where their funds have been appropriated.

In taking our leave of the public, as a *Prov. Com.*, we have the consciousness of having acted in all the matters, pertaining to our work, uprightly and openly; and we now entreat all our friends to act efficiently and promptly in scattering the light of life; and may the blessing of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be upon you all, and guide you to Life Eternal.

GEO. STORRS, *for the Prov. Com.*

New York, March 1st, 1854.

THE FINAL REPORT of the *Prov. Com.* will appear in our next number.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER has about eight hundred paying subscribers, which is 200 less than we ought to have had to commence *semi-monthly;* yet by the closest economy this sum will just about pay for paper and printing, without our receiving a dollar for our labor or office rent. But, through the good providence of the Lord, *one* friend in this city has taken an office for us and pledged himself to pay the rent without charge to us. We should be glad to give the name of this generous individual, but he seeks not to be known, and his name has never appeared in the Examiner.

Now, will our friends abroad give us five or six hundred new subscribers? and thereby contribute to scatter light, and sustain the Editor, whose labor has become much increased by the *semi* monthly issue.

All money sent, to pay for the Examiner, is sent at *our risk.* Do not delay sending, because no agent is at hand: send at once, *yourself.*

REMOVAL.—We have taken an *Office* at No. 130 Fulton Street, to which place we have removed since our last issue. Our office being on the *first* floor is now easily found; and having more room than heretofore, we shall be glad to see those who are interested in the *Life Theme*, and expect to spend much more time in our office. We shall have no time, however, to spend in useless talk. Those who wish to get works, such as we publish, we shall be happy to accommodate; and we wish to put forth a new effort to publish and scatter abroad, by thousands, works on the glorious doctrine of "*Life only through Jesus Christ.*" We wish to show unto men *the way of life.* It is but of small importance to convince them that there is no immortality in sin and suffering, if we cannot also persuade them to "come to Christ that they *may have life.*" Will our friends aid us with funds to use the press in this great work? We design to enlarge our publishing operations so soon as funds will allow us to do it.

We wish, hereafter, all persons writing us would direct—"GEO. STORRS, 130 *Fulton-st., New York:*" or, "*Office of Bible Examiner.*"

We shall probably keep Bibles and other Books, such as are sold by Booksellers, of a moral and literary character: and will endeavor to furnish works, for those who call for them, at a reasonable compensation.

BIBL

NO. IMMORTALITY, NO

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED SEM

At No. 130 Fu

TERMS---One Dolla

Always in A

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR

"REV. C. F. HUDSON."—
one we referred to some wee
who had embraced the doc
only through Christ." He
nati, Ohio. We find in th
ald," Chicago Ill., a lette
which is deeply interesting
to our readers, as follows :—

Bro. Holbrook—In conse
opinion lately made public,
ject of remark, which, thou
ness, is somewhat unpleasan
myself, that I have not ch
I am impressed with the t
mark respecting a supposed
you understand his ignoran
norant of his understand
phlet will show that I have
element of truth in the doc
sent; and if now you can
paper, to correct some m
friends, I shall be obliged.

Some of them seem to
tion" has resulted from rel
rather than the inspired W
my views fully, will, I think
ask that I shall not be pre
cause I am a dissenter. A
point out the fallacy of the
ing in support of the rece
against my counter reasoni
unwarranted speculations.
is simply this: a received
ture must, from the natur
fend itself against objectio
self to human reason, by h
reasonings are deemed cons
God, and thus in a sense
are by no means derived fr
as, counter reasonings are
neous, and therefore unscri
be quite as biblical as thos
posed. In this way, dissen
vantage and suspicion, tho
have the truth on its side
not to be complained of, fo
one who must row agains

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO. IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1854. NO. 6.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"REV. C. F. HUDSON."—This gentleman is the one we referred to some weeks since, in the West, who had embraced the doctrine of "Immortality only through Christ." He is at present in Cincinnati, Ohio. We find in the *Congregational Herald*," Chicago Ill., a letter from Bro. Hudson, which is deeply interesting, and we give it entire to our readers, as follows :—

Bro. Holbrook—In consequence of my change of opinion lately made public, I find myself the subject of remark, which, though designed in all kindness, is somewhat unpleasant. And believing, for myself, that I have not changed my views rashly, I am impressed with the truth of Coleridge's remark respecting a supposed errorist, that "unless you understand his ignorance, you are entirely ignorant of his understanding." My little pamphlet will show that I have tried to recognize the element of truth in the doctrine from which I dissent; and if now you can allow me, through your paper, to correct some misapprehensions of my friends, I shall be obliged.

Some of them seem to think that my "defection" has resulted from reliance on human reason rather than the inspired Word. Those who know my views fully, will, I think, say otherwise. I only ask that I shall not be presumed a rationalist, because I am a dissenter. And when I endeavor to point out the fallacy of the current human reasoning in support of the received doctrine, I protest against my counter reasoning being condemned as unwarranted speculations. The state of the case is simply this : a received interpretation of Scripture must, from the nature of things, seek to defend itself against objection, and to commend itself to human reason, by human reasonings. Such reasonings are deemed consistent with the Word of God, and thus in a sense Scriptural, though they are by no means derived from Scripture. Whereas, counter reasonings are presumed to be erroneous, and therefore unscriptural, though they may be quite as biblical as those to which they are opposed. In this way, dissent must ever incur disadvantage and suspicion, though it may happen to have the truth on its side. The disadvantage is not to be complained of, for the same reason that one who must row against the current does not complain of gravitation or of the tides. I simply venture to say, after much reading and upon mature reflection, that nine-tenths of the standard argumentation in favor of the received doctrine, is human reasoning, as something distinct from biblical exegesis. That my investigations have been mainly biblical, is for me to believe, but not to assert.

I find, again, some prejudice against the literal interpretation of scriptural passages bearing upon the doctrine in question. It may be well to say, every scholar knows that in a cultivated language "literal," and "metaphysical," as applied to the meaning of words, are relative terms. Very few words long retain their original literality of sense. I do not, however, find fault with the distinction, but shall insist upon it. Still, an ultra literalism, appearing for a brief period in the early history of the church, is no excuse for an ultra spiritualism in all after time. How this ultra spiritualism, as I deem it, of which some features of Swedenborgianism are a ripe fruit, has grown out of a certain change in the doctrine of immortality, I think I might show if time permitted; but that is not now my business.

The biblical grounds of my opinion I do not wish to urge; but it is proper that I should state, for the benefit of inquirers, two or three of the points made by those who hold the destructionist view, as I do, viz :—

1. That the divine image in man denotes, not his immortality, but his capacity for holiness, of which eternal life is the promised reward; the "divine image," as Justin Martyr remarks, no more proving an absolute immortality, than absolute eternity of being. And the destruction of a sinful being would be no more a defeat of the divine purpose in creation, than endless being in sin and wretchedness. Immortality, then, is offered to man upon moral conditions.

2. That the term "destruction" in 2d Thes. 1 : 9, is to be taken in a literal sense; and that the preposition "from" is used to express, not the idea of separation or banishment, but the origin or source of this destruction. (See Macknight, Henry, Grotius, and others, compare Acts 3 : 19.)

3. That the terms "hades" and "gehenna" are used in the Bible to denote things altogether distinct; and that no being is cast into gehenna previous to the final judgment and restitution of all things. (See Campbell on the Gospels, dissertation VI.)

4. That the few passages which are supposed to suggest the received doctrine, (though upon the assumption of the soul's immortality,) are equally consistent with the doctrine of the destruction of sinful being, which is abundantly indicated else-

where, if scripture terms are to be taken generally in their obvious sense.

These propositions I offer without argument. Others may discuss them, and none shall charge them with being "wise above what is written." I will only add a historical suggestion, and a remark on the connexions of doctrine.

My suggestion is this—that in the second century, the Christian doctrine, as I deem it, of conditional immortality, instead of supplanting the Platonic doctrine of absolute immortality, began to be engrafted upon it; that in the effort to relieve the undue pressure thus created, the restorationism of Origen was the natural fruit of this alliance, and was the first of a series of restorationisms, of which the purgatory of the Romish Church has been the most prominent; that from this alliance has resulted a "conflict of ages" for which Paul is in no way responsible; and that the final destruction of the wicked, after imprisonment (during the intermediate state) and public trial, so far from being a doctrine of "purgatory," is the scripture refutation of this and all other schemes of universal salvation.

And again: is it not an unwarranted and hazardous thing to argue the divinity of Christ from the supposed need of an infinite sacrifice for the infinite evil of sin? This style of reasoning seems to have been unknown to Athanasius, the Father of Orthodoxy; his ever recurring argument for the divinity of Christ being derived from his power to give life to the dead, and to restore a lost immortality to man. (See John, chap. vi.) Now the argument from the infinite evil of sin is, at least, not biblical; and if we succeed in making an apparent connection between the two doctrines, they are so far likely to share a similar fate. Have our orthodox divines, in this way, unwittingly given occasion and a stumbling block to Socinianism?

Of the history of the dangerous doctrine which I hold, I need not say much. Justin Martyr lived, it seems, before the happy age of doctrinal development; and Richard Whately is perhaps, "eccentric" (as every innovator is *de facto* eccentric.) Be this as it may, I have reached my conclusions without the help of either of them. The prestige of great and good names, of course, proves nothing; but neither is it to be dismissed with a sneer.

Finally, if I were to ask my friends to forgive my difficulty with the received doctrine [of future endless punishment,] I should just remind them of the language of Dr. Dwight: "There are, I know, persons who speak concerning future punishment with an air of cool self-complacency, as being in their view easy of investigation and free from embarrassment. I am inclined, perhaps uncharitably, to give them little credit for candor, clearness of intellect, or soundness of character; and greatly doubt whether it has been investigated by them, either to such an extent, or with such a spirit, as might furnish them with just views of its nature." (Theology, IV., 457.)

I do not know but I have a larger charity for such persons than Dr. Dwight. And I have a right to suggest that reciprocal charity will be promoted by a free investigation of the subject.

Since the foregoing was prepared for the compositor we have received a letter from Bro. Hudson, from which we give the following extract; though possibly he did not design it for the public eye.—Ed. Ex.

—

Cincinnati, March 9, 1854.

George Storrs:—*Dear Bro.*—Mr. F. Y. V., of Walnut Hills, tells me he called upon you some time since, and that, telling you something of my views as concurring with yours, you desired to hear from me. I now take pleasure in complying with your wish, and shall rejoice to make your acquaintance, as a fellow-laborer in the effort to recover from long oblivion and contempt an important article of the faith once delivered to the saints. I can now cordially greet you as a brother, and trust we may receive mutual assistance by comparing notes and by our several labors.

I have come to this city to elaborate my views, and to confirm certain points of history and philology, with advantages, such as I could not find in Chicago. I have taken a small school to help myself in the mean while, until I should be able to execute such plans of preaching or publishing as shall seem best. In that direction I have matured nothing yet.

I have prepared one or two of a series of articles to present an outline of the history and a suggestion of the importance, of the doctrine of specific immortality; though I am not sure I shall get them inserted in any of the papers. Three or four of my friends in the city will be glad to see me get a congregation, and even to establish a church, because they deem my views *safe*, and adapted to the prevention of skepticism in many minds.

How far I shall be able to silence gainsaying among those who never will hear me, I do not know. I do know, however, that there are many indications that this doctrine will speedily be brought forth from obscurity, and will be relied upon to solve what is now called the "Conflict of Ages."

I send you copies of opinions given upon an argument I have prepared, constituting about half of the work I contemplated. These opinions are given by young men of more than ordinary promise in the ministry. How soon I shall be able to bring out my book is altogether uncertain. One of these friends has been quite anxious I should publish a pamphlet, or a brief book, immediately, prefacing that the argument and its ramifications would be made more complete in an after-publication. I prefer, however, if possible, to finish my

book in six or eight months, and publish it so complete that it shall defend itself. I obtained White's book by considerable trouble—have sent for Courtnay's—and also for Dodwell's, as being the book of a learned man, though I am not sure I shall get his writings. I have been much interested in Maimonides, and find that he was once prohibited the Synagogues for holding this opinion,—*i. e.* the synagogues of a certain province, where he was not well known as morally orthodox.

The "opinions" which I send you have never been published,—and I have no authority to publish them. If any thing is done with them, it would be better anonymously, for the present. The fact that I am heterodox is published widely enough, but my book is not in a state to be proclaimed.

The Lord be with you. Pray that the spirit of wisdom and faith may direct.

Yours truly, C. F. HUDSON.

—

The following are the opinions referred to in Br. Hudson's letter.—ED. EX.

Dear Br. H.—I have perused with great pleasure your MS. on "The Future Destruction of the Wicked."

Your views of course, according to the standards of Orthodoxy, would be pronounced *erroneous*, if not *heretical*. But it is certainly most rare we find an error—if error it be—maintained with such an array of scripture, such force and clearness of logic, in a manner so frank and with a spirit so candid, so honest, so Christ-like. It seems, rather, the earnest convictions of the sincere, than the empty boastings of the self-confident.

As servants of Christ, pledged to maintain the faith once delivered to the saints, we most naturally begin to look after our responsibilities, when any doctrine not mentioned in creeds and confessions claims attention. What shall we say of it? How shall we treat it?

Evidently if it be at variance with those principles on which we hold the government of God to be administered—if it is calculated to vitiate those motives designed of God to move the heart and conscience and lead to purity and holines of life, it must be discarded and opposed as an obstacle to the conquests of the gospel.

In this view of the case what shall we say of the Destructionist's theory? Does it assume any new and antagonist principle? Is it calculated to hinder the free course of the gospel?

1st. I cannot see that it does in anywise abate the demands of justice, or defeat the ends of mercy. 2d. I can see how it would produce the *most salutary* effect upon the minds of many. (*a*,) In giving liberty to those who hold the common doctrine *in dubis*, and of consequence suffer a *partial paralysis* in the efforts and joys which are peculiar to the Christian. (*b*.) In reclaiming those who discard the whole system of Christianity because of the common doctrine which they conceive an *essential part* of it.

At all events the doctrine is worthy a thorough investigation. While I must hesitate before acknowledging it, I could not feel justified in condemning, without a much more ample examination of its claims. It may be erroneous, but I doubt whether it can be shown worthy of the epithet heresy, which the apostle regards as a sufficient ground of excommunication.

"Prove all things," is emphatically a Protestant as well as a Christian maxim. And since we hold that the divines of Westminster and the Reformation did not exhume all the jewels of truth from the accumulated rubbish of ages, we should be the more anxious to give free scope to inquiry within the bounds of *known* fundamental privileges.

Knowing you as I do, and believing you have no other desire than to arrive at a full knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, I feel confident your investigations will be productvie of good.

But in conclusion, let me remind you of our Master's promise, "When he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth;" and let us ever most devoutly and thankfully seek his wisdom in all our investigations of divine things.

Yours in Christ, A.

—

Dear Br. H.—After a single and hasty hearing of your agument on the final doom of the wicked which I have been favored, I feel qualified to give only a crude and half formed opinion; yet so far as it is shaped in my mind I will communicate it.

I have been accustomed to regard the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked—so far as it has ever entered my thoughts, which is but slightly—with feelings of mingled abhorrence and contempt, as being in my view akin to the pernicious error of Universalism, and also materialistic, and philosophically base. I am not sure indeed, but that my philosophy revolted at it even more than my religion.

But I confess that these feelings are now wholly done away—at least so far as a view like yours is concerned. Your doctrine is no more materialistic than the common view; for it does not deny that the soul is spiritual in its nature, and fitted for immortal existence; while, on the other hand, those who hold the common theory cannot deny, with all their ideas of its spirituality and immortality, (if I may so speak,) that He who made it is able even now to destroy it in hell. Neither has your doctrine any kinship with these errors, which, denying the punishment of sin, abolish that essential and infinite difference which separates right from wrong, holiness from sin. Your doctrine teaches that an awful and remediless punishment awaits the sinner, and I can see nothing *in the nature of things or in the necessities of moral government*, which makes the common doctrine more probable than yours. Nay, I am compelled to own, that this probability appears to me on the other side.

But it is of course the scriptural argument only that is at all decisive. And here I confess my astonishment at the force of your reasoning—contrary to my previous convictions—and own that I am at present unable to answer it. Your argu-

ment stands in my mind thus—the generic immortality of the soul is not taught in the scripture as a specific doctrine. It is thought, however, to be implied in certain passages teaching the punishment of the wicked. Yet it does not appear to be necessarily, or with absolute certainty, taught in these; while there are many passages, which, unless we hold such a doctrine respecting the future existence of the soul as forces us to give them a metaphysical interpretation, teach plainly that it will be destroyed.

The question then to be decided is, whether the probabilities of the former class of passages are such and so great as to overbalance the probabilities of the latter.

Your candid and able argument has left an impression on my mind in favor of your view—an impression which future investigations, if I am allowed to make them, must either remove or deepen. So far as my knowledge extends, the doctrine of eternal suffering will need a new defence upon the publication of your argument.

I will add, your view gets rid of all the difficulty about the question of positive punishment; it saves also the doctrine of atonement from that depreciation, which belongs to the theory of eternal sinning as the ground of eternal punishment. The relief it gives also to many pious minds is manifest. And if these things do not prove it true, they add to the reasons which should secure it toleration and respect.

With the highest esteem,

Your Br. in the Gospel, S.

THE CROSS.—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

Our respected brother Ham, referring to the testimony of our blessed Lord concerning his death, remarks as follows:—

"His crucifixion, he tells us, was an act of highest impiety and cruel wrong; a manifestation of godless hostility to the holy laws and purposes of the Most High, and merited the severest marks of the divine displeasure. He says no more."

Being, with the pious writer, by divine favor, "set-free to sit at the feet of the great Teacher," let us unite in humbly "asking the Lord Jesus Christ the meaning of his last sufferings and death."

That the meek sufferer considered, as did his inspired apostle, that the crucifixion was the work of "wicked hands," is not to be questioned. Is it true that "he says no more?" Is it not a matter of fact, that he said *more* respecting the *divine design* of his death, than he said in direct condemnation of the act of his murderers? Let us hear him.

"I lay down my life *for the sheep*." "I lay it down of myself." "Therefore doth my Father love me because I lay down my life," &c.—John 10 : 15–18. "The Son of man came—to give his life *a ransom for many*."—Mark 10 : 45. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life*."—John 3 : 14, 15. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. (This he said signifying what death he should die.)" "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give *for the life of the world*."—John 12 : 32, 33; 6 : 51. "This is my blood of the new testament, *which is shed for many for the remission of sins*."—Matt. 26 : 28.

Surely, we must not affirm, that our gracious Redeemer "says *no more*" than that "his crucifixion—was an act of highest impiety," &c. In the above passages, we clearly perceive the same connection between his voluntary death, and the salvation of a lost world, which is exhibited by the inspired prophets and apostles, in passages I have quoted in my former article; particularly in Isa. 53, and Rom. 3 : 25, 26.

The zealous apostle, previous to his enlightenment on this divine purpose, when our dear Lord gave notice of it, said, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned and said unto Peter, get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me: for (in objecting to my sufferings and death) thou savorest not the things that be of God," &c., plainly teaching "the meaning of his last sufferings and death," as being "the things that be *of God*."—Matt. 16 : 21–23.

On the last confiding prayer of "the Son of the Blessed," "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit," brother H. remarks, "How natural is this language in the lips of the dying Christ, on the supposition that he was conscious, at this time, of no other than an endeared filial relationship towards his divine Father; and how *un*natural, on the supposition that he was conscious of being in the attitude of an imputed criminal, expiating a world's offences by suffering the penalty due to those offences." "The Lord Jesus, at this time, was only conscious of a *Father's* presence and a *Father's* sympathy." What then meaneth that affecting exclamation, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" How natural is this language in the lips of the dying Christ on the supposition" that "the Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquities of us all;" how *un*natural, if the Father did *not* "make his life an offering for sin;" "a propitiation—for the sins of the whole world?" How *un*natural is this language according to the views of our intelligent brother. "Awake, O Sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Jehovah of Hosts, smite the Shepherd," &c.—Zech. 13 : 7. He supposes that if the death of the Son of God was of a vicarious character, "we should have expected—language betokening a sense of the most distressing rejection by God," &c. How significant of such "a sense," is the language actually used by the sinner's dying friend; "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

The divine testimony indeed reveals no such absurdity as the Son of God "suffering *the penalty due to (our) offences*," which is "everlasting destruction." Still more absurd is such an opinion on the part of those who believe the penalty to be eternal torment! The truth, however, must not be rejected, that "God hath set (him) forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins

that are past, through the forbearance of God—*that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.*"—Rom. 3 : 25, 26.

I advocate no "scholastic theology" or theory of fallible man. Let us beware, however, lest in plucking up the tares, we pull up the wheat also.

I have only to remark, that the corresponding testimony of the prophets and apostles teaching us that the "last sufferings and death" of the Mediator, were in accordance with the divine purpose, and "a propitiation—for the sins of the world," is of equal authority with that of the Saviour. They "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" "the doctrine" and "the commandments of the Lord."—2 Peter 1 : 21; Acts 13 : 12; 1 Cor. 14 : 37.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS AN EXAMPLE.—BY J. PANTON HAM.

(*Continued from page* 57.)

The question which it was obviously necessary to ask and reply to, in such an inquiry as the present, has now been answered, and we think scripturally answered. The cross, the gibbit of the ancient Gentiles, became identified with the personal history of Christ, because the Jews resisted and rejected his Divine mission. Although foreseen by God, it was not demanded and planned by Him. The honor of His moral government of His creatures could not be upheld by an act of rebellion against that government. The crucifixion of Christ, according to the Scriptures, was a *crime*,—the highest and most aggravated of all crimes,—and can crime be cleansed by crime? Can it be a law of the Christian revelation that the fouler the crime the more perfect it becomes as an agent of moral purification? What! sin *sanctify* sin! sin give a *satisfaction* for sin! sin *save* men from sin! If this be the philosophy of the Churches, the "orthodox" Churches, well might an Apostle exclaim, "beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy * * after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." It is such philosophy as this which props up and gives plausibility to infidelity. The understanding and moral sentiments of men are violently shocked and set at most dangerous defiance by such palpably absurd and offensive dogmas as these. No wonder that a dreary infidelity is diffused over the land. The Churches see and sorrow over the melancholy fact, but they see not that themselves are the creators of the evil they deplore. And they are now seeking for specifics, and think to cure the evil by the more diligent application of its cause! The principles of homœopathy, whatever may be their worth in Materia Medica, have no application to intellectual and moral diseases. The medicine of the mind is not that which deranged it. Truth, not error, is the cure for error. The "orthodox" Churches are not the spiritual physicians of the age, they are empirics who have well nigh extinguished its spiritual life as well as its health. A voice from the Bible, if they could but hear it, commands them to stand aside out of the sunshine of God's pure truth. Neither light nor heat can radiate their genial influences upon the world while they stand in the way. The experiment has been tried on the old, opaque orthodoxy, and the result of centuries of trial have proved it a most effectual spiritual screen. The world has gathered darkness, and grown cold under the sombre shelter of the Churches. And now the world, as well as the Bible, is crying out to one and to all of them, Stand aside! let the light have its course, or our vision will wholly fail us; let the heat of heavenly truth come unhindered to our human hearts, that we may feel its blessed influence and that faith may germinate and grow!

The evidence against the popular theory of the death of Christ includes the important fact that Christ himself, who so frequently referred to his sufferings and death, never so interpreted them. Not the remotest allusion is ever made by him to those notions of the nature and purposes of his last sufferings which are so generally received by professing Christians. We have seen in what manner he spoke of the tragic event,—that he uniformly refers it to the malignancy and impiety of Satan and wicked men. The silence of the Lord himself on these popular and so called evangelical notions is a phenomenon which is altogether inexplicable except on the supposition that these notions are false,—the mere conceits and traditions of men. Add to this important fact that our Lord sometimes used language which no theological ingenuity can make to comport with the popular doctrines, and we have not merely a presumptive evidence against these time-honored notions, but proof demonstrative of their doctrinal falsity. Such language, to select a principal illustration, is furnished in the discourse of the Lord Jesus with the two sons of Zebedee—his disciples, James and John. The reader will recollect that on one occasion these two disciples asked Christ to be allowed to sit, the one on his right-hand, and the other on his left in his kingdom. Upon which the Lord asked them, "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Now if these disciples had understood that the sufferings and death of their Master would be expiatory in their nature, they surely would have replied, "We cannot." But, they answered, "We can!" The reader is requested to give this incident his careful and candid attention. Here is an allusion to that "cup" concerning which Christ, in the bitterness of his grief in Gethsemane, cried, "If it be possible, let *this cup* pass from me." It is commonly said that Christ could only drink of that cup because it was the cup of his Father's wrath against sin, and that it figratively expresses the inconceivable anguish which he had to endure in bearing the judicial recompense of sins.

James and John must certainly have been ignoaant of this view of their Lord's sufferings, or they never would have presumed to reply as they did. Should any one attempt to excuse them on the score of ignorance, they do not escape from the difficulty because Christ did no trebuke these disciples, as we would have expected, if the common opinions of most Christian people are correct, but on the contrary assured them that they should

should drink of the same cup as he was about to drink of. Jesus said unto them, "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup *that I drink of*, and with the baptism *that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized*"!!—Mark 10 : 31. The popular mode of exhibiting the cup and baptism of Christ's sufferings as expiatory, necessarily excludes all participation therein by any other than Christ himself. *He only* could drink of that "cup," He only could pass through the dreadful ordeal of that "baptism." But such is not Christ's mode of representing his sufferings. According to him the principle of his final sufferings was not unique but only the *circumstances*. He acknowledges the possibility of a participation therein, and distinctly declares that James and John should have a *common experience* with himself. "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." In the view of this emphatic language we are permitted to speak with great confidence and say, that the sufferings and death of Christ were *not* of the nature of an expiation,—that they were *not* a *satisfaction* to Divine justice for sin,—and that they were not endured *vicariously* by way of undergoing the just *punishment* due to the guilt of mankind. For to avow these as the real purposes of Christ's sufferings obliges the further avowal that James and John's last sufferings were of the same nature. None can deny that the Lord Jesus, himself, institutes a comparison between his own last sufferings and those of his disciples. He declares in most unequivocal language, that their experience would be *identical* with his own. The "cup" and "baptism" were in *kind* the same. Then it follows, in addition to what we have already inferred, that as both James and John endured violent deaths as witnesses to the truth,—the moral character of Christ's death was the same,—that he suffered and died as a witness of the truth. It was in each case a martyrdom. Christ is called in the book of revelation "the faithful and true witness, (in the Greek, *martyr*.) James and John were faithful unto death. And of Christ it is written, that, "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and *became obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross."

A passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, (Ch. 12,) expresses in a compendious form the several ideas which we have endeavored to place before the reader in these serial papers on the "Doctrine of the Cross." The cross is characterized as a great ignomy, or "Shame;" and is called the "Contradiction," (or opposition) of Sinners against Christ. It is there simply regarded as the expression of sinful resistance to Christ's character and mission. No other aspect of the cross is here recognized by the sacred writer; and this particular aspect is so presented as to necessitate the conclusion that the cross of the Lord Jesus was, in its character and value, not expiatory, but exemplary. On Christ's patient endurance of "*such* contradiction of sinners against himself," he founds his eloquent expostulation, "Ye have not yet resisted unto blood striving against sin," in which, it is observable, that the idea is repeated,—that Christ's death on the cross, was a resistance "unto blood," *not* for the sake of bearing sin—punitively, nor satisfying for sin judicially, but in "striving against sin." His war with sin in all its forms, degrees, and manifestations, was so complete, that, sooner than yield to sin, he would sacrifice his life, or resist unto blood striving against it. By placing an emphasis on the pronoun "*Ye*," we see the significance of this Apostolical memorial. "Ye have not resisted unto blood," &c., clearly implies that the persons addressed ought to be prepared for such a perfect obedience, and that it was possible to attain to it. They are reminded by the example of Christ's suffering and death on the cross, that they should not be weary in the great warfar, but persevere in their godly resistance against sin, even should it cost them their blood;—and are assured that if they do so strive against sin, they will imitate their great Example whose last sufferings and death were of this eminent moral nature.

THE IRISH EVANGELIST;

OR, REV. JOHN HURLY ON IMMORTALITY.

In the last *Irish Evangelist*—a paper edited by Mr. Hurly, Pastor of the Irish Evangelical Church, who worship at 187 Bowery, I find the following language made use of by him, in answer to a Roman Catholic:—

"God at various times selected and inspired men of holy lives, who spake, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, to the common understanding of the people to whom they delivered their divine message. Yet from no paragraph, nor sentence, that they revealed can we deduce the doctrine of man's *natural immortality*. The Bible in many places teaches that God made man for immortality, but nowhere, to our knowledge, does it teach that God made man IMMORTAL.

"We call upon you, or any one sympathizing with your views, to show us one passage from the holy scriptures which teaches the natural immortality of man; or that any being, as yet, is immortal but God. We believe in immortality; and that in humble hope, and patient endurance we seek for glory, honor, and immortality.—Rom. 2 : 7. But, friend, let us tell you that, this immortality, which our soul sighs for, is in Jesus Christ, and not in us.

"The writer, and all the human family, are by nature possessed not of immortality, but of *innate depravity, and consequent mortality*. And this depravity, alas, has seized them, soul, spirit, and body. But blessed be his holy name, who has not left us without a hope; for, through faith in Jesus, and patient continuance in well doing, this corruptible will put on incorruption; and this mortal will put on immortality; and then, and not till then, shall be brought to pass that saying which is written—*Death is swallowed up in victory*. O death, where is thy sting; O grave, where is thy victory.—1 Cor. 15 : 53–58."

It is a cause of thankfulness to God, that notwithstanding the powerful influence Popery holds over the Protestant mind, yet there is now and then a Protestant Minister who dare come out, regardless of the consequences, and enter their *Pro-*

test against all the corrupti
recommend the above arti
serious consideration of th
preaching against Popery
consistently argue against
in your own creed, the g
Church of Rome? I m
How can you consistently
is fallen," when, at the s
cherish, and advocate, t
the whole superstructure

When the Christian v
publicly Protest against
Br. Hurly has done, and
fountain of immortality,
will Babylon *fall* to rise
consistently preach abo
Purgatory, when, at the
the immortality of the so
Purgatory? For it is ev
scious living soul when th
is no chance for a Purgat

The Reformation from
Luther, Calvin, and othe
let it be distinctly unders
tested against about hal
and the Protestant worl
other half—inherent im
fundamental article of the
the Alpha and Omega of
world: and I here assert
tradiction, *it is not in*
does it come from? It
adopted by Popery, and
formers; but it is now
Rev. John Hurly, as a d
Bible.

New York, Feb. 21, 18

HOPE OF ET

A single portion of S
confidence in the teaching
put the whole matter at r
rectly upon the only way
the epistle of Paul to Tit
course of this brief lette
tial principle of Christian
hope, confining himself to
self and Titus directly, o
ciples of the divine admi
(1.) The fallen and sinful
ish, disobedient, deceived,
pleasures, living in malic
hating one another.—(Titu
nating cause of man's rec
love of God toward man,
eousness which we have d
mercy."—(3 : 4, 5.) (3.)
"through Jesus Christ
"Who gave himself for
instrumental causes—faith
servant of God accordin
elect and the acknowledgi
after godliness."—(1 : 1.
ed by the phrase, "they
God."—(3 : 8.) (5.) Th

test against all the corruptions of Popery. I would recommend the above article of Br. Hurly's to the serious consideration of those who are writing and preaching against Popery, and say—How can you consistently argue against Popery, while you hold in your own creed, the grand Root-Errors of the Church of Rome? I mean *natural immortality.* How can you consistently sing, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen," when, at the same time, you hold up, cherish, and advocate, the corruptions on which the whole superstructure of Babylon is erected?

When the Christian world will come out and publicly Protest against natural immortality, as Br. Hurly has done, and look to Christ as the only fountain of immortality, then, and not till then, will Babylon *fall* to rise no more. How can you consistently preach about the inconsistency of Purgatory, when, at the same time you hold to the immortality of the soul, which gave birth to Purgatory? For it is evident, if their is no conscious living soul when the man is dead, then there is no chance for a Purgatory.

The Reformation from Popery is a great work. Luther, Calvin, and others, did great things; but let it be distinctly understood, that they only Protested against about half the Errors of Popery, and the Protestant world has now endorsed the other half—inherent immortality! That is the fundamental article of the Protestant faith. It is the Alpha and Omega of the so called orthodox world: and I here assert, without the fear of contradiction, *it is not in the Bible.* Where then does it come from? It comes from Heathenism, adopted by Popery, and not Rejected by the Reformers; but it is now Protested against by the Rev. John Hurly, as a doctrine not found in the Bible. PATRICK CANNON.

New York, Feb. 21, 1854.

HOPE OF ETERNAL LIFE.

A single portion of Scripture, to one placing confidence in the teachings of the Bible, ought to put the whole matter at rest, and fix the mind directly upon the only way to heaven. I refer to the epistle of Paul to Titus. The apostle, in the course of this brief letter, elucidates every essential principle of Christian experience, practice and hope, confining himself to the experience of himself and Titus directly, or applying general principles of the divine administration to themselves. (1.) The fallen and sinful condition of man—"foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another." (Titus 3 : 3.) (2.) The originating cause of man's recovery—"the kindness and love of God toward man,"—not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy." (3 : 4, 5.) (3.) The mediatorial cause—"through Jesus Christ our Saviour." (3 : 6. "Who gave himself for us." (2 : 14. (4.) The instrumental causes—faith and truth—"Paul, a servant of God according to the faith of God's elect and the acknowledging of the truth which is after godliness." (1 : 1. Christians also designated by the phrase, "they which have believed in God." (3 : 8. (5.) The recovery itself—"he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," (3 : 5; "justified by his grace," (ver. 7. (6.) The extent of this salvation—"which he shed on us abundantly," (ver. 6; "redeem us from all iniquity," (2 : 14. (7.) The mode of life required of the saved—"Holding fast the faithful word," (1 : 9; denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world," (2 : 12; zealous of good works," (ver. 14; "careful to maintain good works." (3 : 8. Finally, the result of this experience—"*that we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.*" (3 : 7.) "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 : 13.

The following conclusions are legitimate:—

1. There is a state or condition properly denominated "eternal life," which state is to be enjoyed in another world; "for what a man hath, why doth he yet hope for?"

2. There is an exercise of the mind or heart, properly termed, "the hope of eternal life." This "hope" is a sincere desire of eternal life, associated with a well founded expectation of enjoying it.

3. Eternal life is an inheritance, and as such belongs only to the legal "heirs."

4. Man, in his natural state, is not an "heir according to the hope of eternal life." Paul and Titus were *made* heirs by grace. Not naturally so—neither "by works of righteousness which we have done."

5. Man is an alien from the house of God, in such sense as deprives him of the rights and privileges of heirship; else how could he be "adopted," how be "made" an heir?

6. No election before the world began, constituted any man an heir. Paul was one of "God's elect;" but his election did not make him an heir, because he was justified by grace *that he might be made* an heir according to the hope of eternal life. His heirship was a result of his justification; his justification was not the result of his election to heirship.

7. Genuine Christian experience, faithfully maintained, will constitute any man an "heir according to the hope of eternal life."

Dear reader, "examine yourself whether you are in the faith." "Prove your own self." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." "He that believeth hath the witness in himself." Whoever receives the same work of grace with Paul, will receive "the spirit of adoption," which will bear witness with his spirit that he is a child of God; and if a child, then an heir of God, and a joint heir with Jesus Christ. (Rom. 8 : 1–16. If, on examination, you have not been *made* an heir "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," rest not, till by repentance of all sin, renunciation of every false hope, and implicit faith in Christ as your present and everlasting Saviour, you fly for refuge from the consequences of alienation from God, and "lay hold upon "THE HOPE set before you in the Gospel." Having this hope, you may have "strong consolation," and "abound more and more in the work of the

Lord, knowing that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." You may then be prepared to give a *reason* of the hope that is in you, claiming with the great apostle to the Gentiles, that you have been *made* an heir *according* to the hope of eternal life.—*Zion's Herald.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1854.

New Subscribers will be furnished with the Examiner from January 1st, unless they order otherwise. But we cannot make any abatement in the price if they do not take the back numbers. Our terms are one dollar for *the* year. That sum pays only to December 15th, begin when the subscriber will, so long as we can supply all the numbers for the volume. Any one, on reflection, will see the propriety of this course, as we publish an even number at each issue, and the numbers not taken are broken sets, and lost to us.

Continued Articles.—We have found ourselves in difficulty in publishing articles, which are "*to be continued,*" before we knew to what extent they would reach. They have sometimes run through a volume and extended into the following: thus depriving those who did not continue their subscription of the benefit of the entire argument; and new subscribers are not interested in a mere *conclusion*. We have determined, therefore, not to commence a series of articles, hereafter, till we have them all before us, and then we shall exercise our best judgment in their insertion.

We wish it distinctly understood that we do not endorse all the sentiments contained in any article, whether original or selected; but we do not think it either necessary or courteous to express dissent to every idea that does not harmonize with our own. We think our readers have intelligence enough to judge, with their Bibles in their hands, of the correctness of anything which appears in our columns, without our standing as censor over every expression.

More Immortal-soulism.—We clip the following from one of the daily papers of this city:—

A portion of the Chinese believe in a variety of hells for those who lead irreligious lives in the present world. One of these hells they say is stuck full of knives; another is a great iron boiler, filled with scalding water; in another, liars' tongues are pulled out, &c., &c. It is no uncommon thing to hear them pray, "May I not fall into the hell of swords," or into this or that place of torment.

Such is the natural result of the belief of an immortal soul in man. We hear prayers among professing Christians that differ not, essentially, from that in the foregoing item. Indeed, it seems to be the burden of nearly all christendom to know how they "shall escape *such* a hell" as their theologians describe. It seems to concern them but little that *sin* is a dishonor done to God; and that His glorious character and attributes demand our love and homage. If they can only escape the hell of eternal torment they seem to be quite at ease, and leave others to serve God from principle, and because His perfections, and especially *His love*, claim our love and obedience.

What better can we expect than just such ideas as the Chinese have, so long as men believe themselves possessed of an immortal entity, and that their God will inflict undescribable torments on the creatures he has made?

THE THEOLOGICAL HELL:

For the want of time to write a more extended article on the above topic, we give the following *extract* from our last speech at the "Hartford Bible Convention," as reported.—Ed. Ex.

—

I need not again state the position I occupy. It is possible that some of my friends on the opposite side may think that I grant them all they contend for. I have not contended that every word in the Bible is inspired: I have only contended that it contains a history of revelations in certain ages, made by certain instruments, which God has employed; and a history of certain facts and transactions which were connected with those ages in which the revelations were made. I shall go perhaps a step further,—that no man is called upon to receive as a revelation that which plainly and palpably contradicts right reason. If, therefore, I was convinced that there were doctrines in this Bible, claiming to be inspired of God, that contradicted my sense of what was right, when weighed in the balance of right reason, I would not feel myself bound to receive them as a revelation from God; because the God of the same Bible says, "Come, now, let us reason together." He appeals to our reason, and that very appeal imports that he has nothing to say that will shock right reason. I feel for the position, condition, and situation of many intelligent friends on the other side, who, loving and appreciating virtue, reject *the Bible*, as they suppose, though, in fact, they reject the *traditions* of men and the corruptions of theologians. They suppose, indeed, that the Bible teaches certain doctrines which shock their reason; and they reject

We hear prayers among pro-
at differ not, essentially, from
item. Indeed, it seems to be
all christendom to know how
uch a hell" as their theolo-
ems to concern them but lit-
nor done to God; and that
r and attributes demand our
f they can only escape the hell
ey seem to be quite at ease,
rve God from principle, and
ons, and especially *His love,*
edience.
e expect than just such ideas
so long as men believe them-
n immortal entity, and that
t undescribable torments on
nade?

LOGICAL HELL:

ne to write a more extended
opic, we give the following
t speech at the "Hartford
s reported.—Ed. Ex.

tate the position I occupy.
ie of my friends on the oppo-
t I grant them all they contend
ended that every word in the
ve only contended that it con-
elations in certain ages, made
s, which God has employed;
n facts and transactions which
those ages in which the reve-
shall go perhaps a step fur-
called upon to receive as a
plainly and palpably contra-
f, therefore, I was convinced
nes in this Bible, claiming to
at contradicted my sense of
weighed in the balance of
not feel myself bound to re-
tion from God; because the
e says, "Come, now, let us
e appeals to our reason, and
orts that he has nothing to
ight reason. I feel for the
nd situation of many intelli-
her side, who, loving and ap-
ct *the Bible*, as they suppose,
reject the *traditions* of men
of theologians. They sup-
e Bible teaches certain doc-
heir reason; and they reject

the Bible supposing that these doctrines are contained in it; and if they really think so, I cannot blame them for rejecting it. I do not know how they could feel otherwise than they do while they suppose that book contains some of the doctrines attributed to it by theologians.

The most horrible and shocking of all doctrines the last speaker on this stand referred to, and therefore I feel called upon to refer to it myself in my remarks this evening. That speaker came forwith the declaration, that the Bible taught the doctrine of *eternal misery*. With that assumption I take issue. I deny it. The Bible teaches no such doctrine—either in the Old or New Testament. I admit that theologians, professing to understand what the Bible teaches, have taught such doctrines; and she may have supposed that theologians ought to know whether the Bible taught it or not. But theologians may, in these last days, be as mistaken in regard to these things as other men. I take the position that there is not a solitary expression in the Bible that countenances the *theological* notions of hell. What is the theological hell? I will sum it up from the catechism. It is, that there is a dark, bottomless pit, full of fire and brimstone, where the wicked drink in eternal, unmitigated torture—torture continually increasing, and without end. That is the theological notion of hell; and if the last speaker really supposes that the Bible teaches such a doctrine, I cannot blame her for rejecting the Bible. She says that the Bible does teach it; and what text does she quote to prove it? She could not tell us exactly; but I will tell you that the first text referred to by her is found in Mark 9 : 43, and it relates to the expression of our Lord, "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched," etc.

This was the text mainly relied on in proof that the Bible teaches *a hell of endless torments*. I maintain that no such doctrine is taught by this declaration, as has been assumed. To settle this point, we want to get a clear and scriptural explanation of the term "hell;" and I wish the congregation to mark distinctly that the text says, "It is better to enter into *life* halt, or maimed, than to be cast into hell." The very expression tells you that *life* is what is to be *lost* if the person does not pursue a certain course, and not endless torment to be endured. Now there are in the New Testament three words that are translated in our language "hell:" *Gehenna, Hades,* and *Tartarus;* the latter occurring but once, and that in 2 Peter 2 : 4. The term "*Gehenna*" occurs twelve times in the New Testament. The term "*Hades*" occurs eleven times, and ten times out of the eleven is translated "hell," and once, in 1 Cor. 15 : 55, is translated "grave." The term "*Gehenna,*" and the term "*Hades,*" in the original, have entirely different significations, as every one knows who knows anything about the original. But we are not, on this account, to throw any blame on the Bible; the blame lies on the translators? The *translation* is not inspiration. It is the work of fallible, erring men, and in no place erring more than in translating *Hades,* "hell."

In the Old Testament (Hebrew), the only term that is translated "hell," is *Sheol,* which occurs sixty times, and thirty-one times out of sixty it is translated "hell." It has precisely the meaning of *Hades,* in the New Testament; and yet thirty-one times in the Old Testament it has been translated "hell," and at other times "grave," etc., according to the judgment of the translators.

My time is so limited, of course, that I have to take but a mere glance at this subject. The term *Hades* does not occur in the text quoted this afternoon, but the term *Gehenna.* The translators might better have left it untranslated. We will give you an explanation of it, as given in "The Polymicrian Greek Lexicon," by Greenfield. "*Gehenna,* properly the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem; once celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch, and afterward polluted with every species of filth, as well as the carcases of animals, and dead bodies of malefactors; to consume which, in order to avert the pestilence which such a mass of corruption would occasion, constant fires were kept burning."

The term *Gehenna* is composed of the words, *Ge,* a valley, and *Hinnom,* a man's name. Dr. George Campbell, an eminent divine—and orthodox, by the way—tells you that the term *Gehenna* never occurs in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, nor in any classic author in the world. Then we are shut up to the use of the term among the Jews. What did it mean among the Jews? Place yourself one moment in Jerusalem, where Jesus stood; look outside of that city, and see the Valley of Hinnom, *Gehenna.* That valley, in the the days of the ministration of Jesus, was the receptacle of the filth of the city, carcases of dead animals, and the bodies of malefactors. What purpose did it serve? Was it designed to *preserve* and keep in existence everything cast into it? Every one knows that whatever was cast into that

Gehenna, was cast in there to be made an *end of*. When the Saviour says, "It is better to enter into *life* maimed, than to be cast into hell," (*Gehenna*), he only uses an expression equivalent to saying, "It is better for you to possess life, to continue in being, by losing one hand or one eye in the present time, than to be *totally destroyed* at last for your sins." The term, then, in the text, imports a total or entire *destruction*, and not *preservation*, under any circumstances. It has no such signification as theologians put upon it.

The idea that the term *unquenchable* fire imports a fire "never to go out," or that shall "burn eternally," it is easy to show, by its use among the Jewish prophets, has no such meaning, but simply imports *utter destruction* that cannot be resisted. And such is its common-sense meaning always. A gentleman's house is on fire, and the firemen hasten to his assistance; he says, "Effort is useless, it is *unquenchable*." Does he mean the fire will burn *eternally*, or simply that the house will be *totally destroyed*? If the fire could be quenched, some part of the house might be *preserved*; but it is unquenchable, and therefore total destruction is certain. Any school-boy knows that is the common-sense meaning of the term, however theologians may pervert it. The text, then, gives no support to the notion of the "theological hell," or endless torments.

If the term *Hades*, so often translated "hell," had been uniformly translated, we never would have reason and common sense shocked by the doctrine of endless torture. No, never. Why do the translators sometimes translate, in the Old Testament, the term *Sheol*, "hell," and sometimes "grave?" I will compare two texts—one found in the Old Testament, where the term *Sheol* occurs, and one in the New Testament, where the term *Hades* is used as the proper correspondent of the term *Sheol*. In Psalm 16 : 10, it is said of the Messiah, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," (the original is *sheol*), "neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." In Acts 2 : 31, Peter speaking of David, says, "He seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell"—*Hades*, not *Gehenna*, an entirely different word, and having an entirely different meaning; and yet our translators have translated it the same as though it were *Gehenna*. We have shown that the terms *Sheol* and *Hades* are precisely of the same import. Now, when the word *Sheol* is so often translated "the grave," why should they not translate the term *Hades* in the same manner? They did not do so, because they believed in the natural immortality of the soul; and if they had translated, "thou wilt not leave my soul in the grave," they would say that Christ's soul died, as it did. "What, Christ's soul die!" Yes, sir, Christ's soul died. "You mean Christ's body?" No, sir; whatever constituted Christ went into the grave and died; and had the translators been faithful in translating here, we should never have heard of Christ's going to the theological hell. Rather than give up the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, they would send Christ to *hell!* Yes, to a hell of *endless torments*. But, unfortunately for their theory, he got out of it, and so others may. The fact is, *Sheol* and *Hades* never mean a place of suffering. The terms signify "covered," "out of sight," and are used in the Scriptures almost uniformly to signify the state of the dead—a state which is hidden from our view—and this the testimony of the Bible clearly confirms. It says, Eccl. 9 : 10, that "in *Sheol* there is no knowledge," and, consequently, no suffering.

I must charge our translators with being warped by the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul. In the passage 1 Cor. 15 : 55, wherein it says, "O grave, where is thy victory?" the original term is *hades*. Why did they not translate it "hell" here as they did in every other instance where the term occurs? Because if they had done so they would have proved that there is to be a victory over *hell*. In Hosea 13 : 14, it says, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death; O death, I will be thy plague; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Why did they not translate the word *sheol* in this passage "hell" instead of "grave?" Because they would not allow the shadow of the idea that a soul could be delivered from hell to be taught in the translation. The term used here is *sheol*. "I will redeem them from death; O grave—O *sheol*—I will be thy destruction." Had it been translated *hell* instead of *grave*, it would have proved that *hell* is to be destroyed, and consequently all the wicked in it delivered or destroyed with it. The fact is, *sheol* nor *hades* have never any such sense as theologians attach to the term hell. The doctrine of eternal torments, or the theological hell, then, is not a doctrine of the Bible.

AN EXTRACT.—What I say or write to day, I do not engage to stand by, or to defend to morrow; it is but my foot-print, left for others to see that I have been in this dispensation. By the time you read this, the spirit may have led me into a higher and purer state. Then say you, "What do I learn?" verily that the road to perfection is strewed with imperfections and crudities.

"THE ETERNAL MISERY OF HELL."

Such is the title of Tract No. 277, of the American Tract Society, New York. That Society published it several years ago; it had disappeared, we thought, entirely; but it has reappeared in a new dress. It is an extract from Saurin's Sermon on the subject. Let it have a wide circulation: it will work its own cure. The days of superstition are passing away; and thinking men will not take assumptions for truth: they will demand scripture evidence in harmony with sober reason. We noticed this Tract in 1847; but as it has appeared anew we think best to renew our notice. The first point it takes up is, "*The quality and the duration of the punishment of hell.*" It says: "*A privation of celestial happiness* is the first idea of hell." Upon this point the author makes some sensible remarks, but says: "We seldom think we have *immortal souls.*" Why should "*mortal man*" [Job] "think" that he has that which is only the *gift of God*, through Jesus Christ, at the resurrection, "to them who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for immortality*"? See Rom. 2: 7.

The author next considers the "*painful sensations.*" Here he has the common theory briefly, but fully, brought out to view, with such a strange mixture of truth and error as one would almost think could not fail to convince his own mind that his theory was both false and blasphemous. He gives a true definition of the term "Hell Fire," and its origin; and then proceeds from it to show that his God is as much more horrible than Moloch as omnipotence is more powerful than the "monstrous machine" or iron image, which "*consumed* the miserable infant victims of [the idolaters'] cruel superstition." Moloch "consumed" his "victims" almost instantly; but the God of Mr. Saurin and the American Tract Society, while his "horrible" burnings are equal to those of Moloch, yet does not intend to *consume* his victims, but to keep them in this perpetual torture: and this is said, too, in the face of the plain and positive declaration of the Holy Spirit that "the enemies of the Lord *shall be consumed*—into smoke shall they consume away." See Psalm 37: 20. Let us here give you the very language of the tract. It says:—

"The very name given in Scripture to the fire of hell hath something very significant in it: it is called *the fire of Gehenna.*—Matt. 5: 22. This word is compounded of words which signify *the valley of Hinnom:* this valley was rendered famous by the abominable sacrifices which the idolatrous Jews offered to Moloch. They set up a hollow brazen figure, inclosed their children in it, kindled fires underneath, and in this horrible manner consumed the miserable infant victims of their cruel superstition. This is an image of hell—terrible image! We have no need of abstract and metaphysical ideas. Who among us could patiently bear his hand one hour in fire! who would not tremble to be condemned to pass one day in this monstrous machine? and who—who could bear to be eternally confined in it—"and yet forbid to die?" When we see a criminal in chains, given up to an executioner of human justice, and just going to be burnt to death, nature shudders at the sight—the flesh of spectators shivers—and the cries of the suffer rend their heart, and excite, in painful compassion, all the emotions of the soul! What then must it be to be delivered up to an executioner of *divine justice!* What to be cast into the fire of hell! Delicate flesh! feeble organs of the human body! what will you do when you are cast into the quick and devouring flames of hell?"

How are the "flames of hell *devouring*," when, according to the theory here maintained, nothing is ever devoured? Was ever a greater piece of folly, contradiction, and blasphemy put together in so few words as in this one quoted paragraph? It seems hardly possible to exceed it.

The tract, after mentioning several other things that go to make up future punishment, no one of which is "*death*," but such as the following, viz: "Remorse of Conscience," "Horrible society of Hell," &c., proceeds to say:—

"From all these ideas results a *fifth*—an *increase of sin.* As God will aggravate the sufferings of the damned by displaying his glorious attributes, their hatred of him will be unbounded—their torment will excite their hatred—their hatred will aggravate their torment. Is not this the height of misery? To be filled with unmixed hate toward the Perfect Being, the Supreme Being, the Sovereign Beauty—in a word, to hate the infinite God! Doth not this idea present to your mind a state the most melancholy, the most miserable? One chief excellence of the glory of happy spirits is a consummate love to their Creator. One of the most horrible punishments of hell is the exclusion of divine love. O miserable state of the damned! In it they utter as many blasphemies against God as the happy souls in heaven shout alleluiahs to his praise."

So sin is to be *perpetuated*, and the God of the endless misery theorist is eternally to hear as many *curses* and blasphemies poured into his ears as there are *praises*, or shouts of alleluiahs!! Doubtless to *keep him humble!!* Such a God we do not worship: to such a God we owe no homage: such a God is not revealed in the Bible, and nowhere else, except in the imaginations and creeds of men who have been corrupted by the "vain philosophy" of Paganism, "after the traditions of men—and not after Christ."

What influence does this doctrine have upon its advocates who have been deluded enough *really to believe it?* For few, very few, who *profess* to be-

ieve it, really do so. Let us hear the author of the tract on this point: and we suppose him sincerely to believe his theory: let him speak then as to the influence it has on his mind, and see if it inspires that Christian joy and cheerfulness which the Bible uniformly enjoins—such as: "Rejoice evermore," "Joy unspeakable and full of glory," &c., &c. Hear the tract now:—

"I sink under the weight of the subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations, the people of my charge—when I think that I, that you, that we are all threatened with these torments—when I see, in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the langor of my love, in the faintness of my resolutions and designs, the least evidence, though it be only probable or presumptive, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a *mortal poison*, which diffuses itself into every period of my life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter—I cease to wonder that a fear of hell has made some melancholy, and others mad; that it has inclined some to expose themselves to a living martyrdom by fleeing from all commerce with the rest of mankind, and others to suffer the most violent and terrible torments."

Is such the spirit the pure gospel and truth of God inspires? All intelligent and unprejudiced beings in the universe must answer, NO: it is a spirit as opposed to the gospel as bigotry and superstition is opposed to the liberty and peace which the truth of God produces in an understanding mind.

Hear the marvelous conclusion of this tract. It says:—

"O! if there remained the least spark of reason in us, the image of hell would make the deepest impression on our souls, and give us no rest til we had full evidence that our feet were planted on the Everlasting Rock!"

One would think there could not be "the least spark of reason" left in any one who supposes that like does not produce like. People are changed into the "image" of that they are constantly beholding. Instead of the "image of" such a "hell" as described in this tract, and as presented in the common theory on this subject, leading men to "plant" their "feet on the Everlasting Rock," it leads them to such a state of mind as the tract describes, which we have already quoted—to a rejection of the Bible altogether; or, to a hypocritical profession of serving God, whilst they have no love for such a character as they are taught God possesses; nor, indeed, is it possible for any perfectly sane mind to love such a being as this tract represents God to be. The penalty of God's law is "*death*"—"the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." We shall not here dwell upon what death is except to say, to our mind, nothing is clearer from the Book of God, than that it is cessation of conscious being—to "be as though they had not been:"—Obadiah 16; and a thousand other texts equally explicit.

A PROPOSITION.

C * * *, OHIO, Feb. 25, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—I wish to make a proposition to the readers of the EXAMINER. I believe we all appreciate the labor of Br. Storrs in this branch of Christian doctrine, viz.: "Immortality through Christ alone." We esteem him highly for his efforts to advance the cause of Christ. The BIBLE EXAMINER, in the reading of which we have enjoyed so often "a feast of fat things," has been established and sustained by his indefatigable labor, both mentally and physically. Recently the EXAMINER has been commenced semi-monthly, instead of monthly as heretofore, with no increase of price. Now, brethren, if Br. Storrs is so mindful of our interest, let us not be forgetful of him. I propose that each reader of the EXAMINER who believes that Br. Storrs is engaged in a good work, present a free-will offering of their substance to him, in order to enlarge the boundaries of his usefulness—being assured that even in this life *we* shall derive a benefit from such an investment. As a small beginning I send two dollars, hoping, small as it is, it may prove a *seed* bearing more fruit. Come, brethren, who will be the first to water it?

Yours for the truth, H. E. C.

The foregoing proposition came to us a day or two after our loss by the fire, and it deeply affected our heart, so that tears could scarcely be withheld. It seemed as if God were forestalling us, and sending us aid before we had asked; it brought to our mind the gracious promise, "Before they call I will answer them." Br. H. E. C. will accept our thanks, and be assured that he has made our heart glad through his kindness. May the Lord reward him.

We had scarcely finished the last expression when the following letter came to hand and opened the fountain anew. May the blessing of God rest on Bro. Hart also.

SOUTHINGTON, CONN., March, 11, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—I learn from the EXAMINER that you receive nothing for your labor in publishing the same. I, for one, feel that it ought not to be so; and I trust that brethren generally feel that you should be rewarded for your services. I have concluded to send you two dollars now, and will send three more as soon as I can.

I think the EXAMINER is better this year than ever, if possible. May the Lord sustain you and make you wise in winning souls to Christ. I hope you will continue to give us your views of prophesy. Yours in hope of Eternal Life,

ROSWELL HART.

PHILADELPHIA.—We i
Philadelphia, by letter, of
the EXAMINER, and our los
ceived a kind response thr
dated March 14th, who say

Br. Storrs—The friends
thise with you in your los
affected thereby. A reso
Sunday morning, appropri
hands of the Treasurer of
for the purpose of relievin
enclose $10, two of which
son, and the rest from my
to do something more for y
I have been requested
ters of Philadelphia to w
friends of the cause scatter
the following an insertion i
the EXAMINER:—

TO THE FRIENDS AND
EXAMINER:—*Dear Brethr*
as we do the worth of the
portance of such a paper-
the Publisher, to issue it t
small sum of one dollar p
laborer is not getting the
and looking at that golden
unto others as ye would th
you," we feel compelled to
the friends of the cause, *wh*
tender to Br. Storrs a free
ditional sum of fifty cent
year's subscription. We
a great sacrifice for the ca
that he is furnishing his p
than pay the cost of pape
nothing about his own la
friends of the paper—you
a small sum for each one;
brother as a grateful help
As we have heard of t
fallen upon Br. Storrs in
plates, it will be about as
ing to bear our Brother's
can do it. Yours in hope
tality of which the EXAMI

In behalf of the little
Philadelphia.

Br. Grim and our belov
in Philadelphia, may be as
ly the out-gushings of thei
Lord enrich you all with H
unto Life Eternal, through
The proposition to those "
fifty cents to their subscrip
we must decline. If any
more or less, as a donation,
gratitude.

The following was recei
the foregoing communicati

PHILADELPHIA.—We informed our friends in Philadelphia, by letter, of the delay in the issue of the EXAMINER, and our loss by fire. We have received a kind response through Br. Jacob Grim, dated March 14th, who says :—

Br. Storrs—The friends in Philadelphia sympathise with you in your loss, and seem very much affected thereby. A resolution was adopted on Sunday morning, appropriating the amount in the hands of the Treasurer of our little body to you, for the purpose of relieving you in your loss. I enclose $10, two of which is from Sister Grieveson, and the rest from myself. I hope to be able to do something more for you before long.

I have been requested by the brethren and sisters of Philadelphia to write an appeal to the friends of the cause scattered abroad. Please give the following an insertion in the present number of the EXAMINER :—

TO THE FRIENDS AND PATRONS OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER :—*Dear Brethren and Sisters*—Feeling as we do the worth of the EXAMINER, and the importance of such a paper—and the liberal offer of the Publisher, to issue it twice each month for the small sum of one dollar per annum—we feel the laborer is not getting the worth of his services ; and looking at that golden rule which says : "Do unto others as ye would that they should do unto you," we feel compelled to make the request that the friends of the cause, *who are able to do it*, should tender to Br. Storrs a free-will offering of the additional sum of fifty cents each for the present year's subscription. We know that he is making a great sacrifice for the cause of truth ; the price that he is furnishing his paper for will not more than pay the cost of paper and printing, to say nothing about his own labor. We appeal to the friends of the paper—you that are able. It is but a small sum for each one ; yet it will be felt by our brother as a grateful help in the cause of Truth.

As we have heard of the calamity which has fallen upon Br. Storrs in the loss of paper and plates, it will be about as pleasant a way of helping to bear our Brother's burden as any that we can do it. Yours in hope of that Life and Immortality of which the EXAMINER teaches.

JACOB GRIM, Com.

In behalf of the little church worshipping in Philadelphia.

Br. Grim and our beloved Brethren and Sisters in Philadelphia, may be assured that we feel deeply the out-gushings of their sympathy. May the Lord enrich you all with His abundant grace, even unto Life Eternal, through Jesus our Life-Giver. The proposition to those "who are able," to add fifty cents to their subscription for the EXAMINER, we must decline. If any judge best to help us, more or less, as a donation, we shall receive it with gratitude.

The following was received the next day after the foregoing communication.

PHILADELPHIA, March 14, 1854.

Br. Storrs—On behalf of our little church and congregation, I am requested to forward to you any funds remaining in my hands ; I therefore enclose you $25, which we wish you to accept from us as a small present to assist you in the publication of the BIBLE EXAMINER.

We were extremely sorry to hear of your loss by fire, and sincerely hope the lovers of God and Truth will not let you suffer on that account. Be pleased, also, to accept our best wishes for the life that now is, and especially for that which is to come. Yours in sincerity, &c.,

D. W. WHITE, Treasurer.

From Charles M. Shepard.

HIGHLAND, Ill., March 5, 1854.

Br. Storrs—Enclosed I send my subscription for the EXAMINER. I wish I had $50 to send for books for distribution. It is between five and six years since I read your "Six Sermons," which was the first I ever heard of the "infidel" doctrine of man's *entire mortality*, since which time the Bible has beeh a new book to me. I have read such works as I could procure, and have scattered some cheap publications, which, together with conversation, has awakened some interest. All that is needed to bring many out upon the side of truth, is for some one who is able rightly to divide the Word, to come here and lecture a while. Br. Battersby delivered three discourses in this neighborhood about four years ago, which is the only preaching that has ever been heard here by one who *believed* the Bible. Should any of the brethren pass this way I should be happy to have them call on me. Any one coming to St. Louis could take the Ohio and Miss. R.R., to Lebanon, about seven miles from my house, where I would meet him, if apprised of the time.

From Thomas Garbutt.

ORANGEPORT, N. Y., Feb. 28, 1854.

Bro. Storrs—Another month is gone : its disappointments and hardships I hope soon to be forgotten ; its blessings, I think, long to be remembered by me and others. Our meeting in Lewiston was a blessed one ; the Lord was with us—his power was seen and felt by all, saint and sinner. Some eight or ten, we trust, have come over on the Lord's side, with a number of backsliders ; and blessed be God, our meetings are still interesting. I shall in all probability meet with the church in that place for the year to come, every Sunday morning.

This month is also, according to your notice, my last under the patronage of the Prov. Com. With regard to it, I think it was a scriptural and good arrangement. But Committee or no Committee, Society or no Society, Church order or disorder—I feel determined to serve God. And my prayer is, that we may not only strive to pull down the old walls of Babylon, but strive most earnestly to build up the walls of God's building ; and build it of "gold, silver, and precious stones." I do wish to see a waking up to this subject. I fear that some of my brethren are asleep in this matter. Hundreds possess the zeal of a Saul of Tarsus in

pulling down, but no zeal to build up. Thus, much labor is lost: good and wise men spend their strength in vain. May the Lord help us to feel more for sinners, many of whom are driven into black darkness by professors of religion.

May the Lord prosper the EXAMINER, and bless the Editor and the readers.

—

BR. C. M. RICHMOND writes from Peru, Ind:—"I have recently heard of two Ministers in an adjoining county, who have embraced the truth, [on the Life theme]. One of them has been excluded.

RESURRECTION AND LIFE.

"Jesus said unto Martha, I am the resurrection and the life."—JOHN 11 : 21.

These interesting and hope-inspiring words, as they originally flowed from the lips of our benign Redeemer, must have dropped softly and soothingly on the broken heart of the sister of Lazarus. The brother whom she loved had been committed to the dust; and although she had faith in his "resurrection at the last day," yet the idea of being separated from him during an interval, to her comprehension, so indefinitely prolonged, filled her with the deepest sorrow. The Savior here compassionately reminds her that *He* was the author of the resurrection, and that his power to raise the dead could be exercised *then* as well as at the period she mentioned—"I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth on me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."

It is not, however, with the effect of the Savior's declaration on the mind of Martha to which we at present request attention, but to the meaning of the declaration itself—"I am the resurrection and the life." Concerning the import of the first part of this high title self-claimed by the Messiah, there has been little if any dispute. Most cordially do we endorse the exposition given of it by the excellent and popular commentator, *Albert Barnes*. In his note on the passage, he says, "*I am the resurrection*; I am the author or cause of the resurrection. It so depends on my power and will that it may be said I *am* the resurrection. This is a most expressive way of saying that the whole doctrine of the resurrection came from him, and the whole power to effect it was his."

With the second part of the Savior's affirmation the case is entirely different. While the word "resurrection" is understood *literally*, the term "life" is interpreted *figuratively*, as indicating, not "existence," but "happiness." Humbly, yet firmly, do we pronounce such a method of exposition to be a reckless defiance of the laws of criticism, and the dictates of common sense. If the term "resurrection" is to be understood in its natural and common acceptation as denoting "the raising of the dead," then why understand the term "life" in the very unnatural and uncommon sense of "happiness?" Most assuredly "happiness" is far from being synonymous with life; so much so indeed, that, as remarked by Dr. Whately, "in all ages and countries 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied, in ordinary discourse, to a wretched life no less properly than to a happy one." Clearly it is not of happiness, but of life, that the Savior is discoursing. Martha grieved not because her brother was unhappy, but because he was DEAD; therefore Jesus assures her that he was "the resurrection and the life"; and that though believers in him might die, he would nevertheless re-endow them with life. To interpret the term "life," as here employed, to mean happiness, "would be," to employ the words of Mr. Dobney, "not only gratuitous, but would spoil the beautiful propriety of our Lord's discourse on that sorrowful occasion, and make it altogether irrelevant." We by no means deny that the life, of which Jesus here styles himself the fountain, shall be one of the most exquisite enjoyment; this is positively affirmed in various passages of scripture, and from the necessity of the case it must be so; what we maintain is, that the term "life" can express no such idea.

We therefore prefer taking the term "life," as it stands in this passage, in its natural and ordinary meaning, and understand our Lord as declaring that he was the only source of "the resurrecction and the life." From the entire scope of the passage we are evidently to understand our Lord as referring to the life that is to be enjoyed at and subsequent to the resurrection—that everlasting, incorruptible existence on which the redeemed of the Lord are destined to enter, when at his return in the clouds of heaven he shall summon his sleeping ones from the tomb. This view of the passage most beautifully harmonizes with the whole teaching of the New Testament in relation to our Lord Jesus Christ. Often does he represent himself alone as the source of eternal life to perishing men. "I am the bread of life."—"As the living Father hath life in himself, so hath he given the Son to have life in himself."—"The Son quickeneth"—giveth life—"to whom he will.—Because I LIVE YE SHALL LIVE ALSO."

The common belief that men have eternal existence, independent of Christ, that they are immortal by nature, thus denies the Savior's claim here put forward for our acknowledgment, and robs him of his peculiar glory as the Life-imparting One. And our object in writing out these remarks is not for the mere controverting of opposite opinions; it is that the Messiah may appear in the true grandeur of his character—that men by so viewing him may be induced lovingly to contemplate him as "the resurrection and the life." Happy, thrice happy, they who look for "the blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of God our Savior;" for "when he who is their life shall appear, then shall they also appear with him in glory."—*Mon. Exp.*

ANECDOTE OF JOHN PALMER.

About thirty years ago, died the Rev. John Palmer, for some thirty or forty years the successful pastor of the First Baptist Church at Shrewsbury, England. Perhaps very few men ever more fully discharged the duties of an evangelist than did he. Very often would he make his appointments, and have them published in North Wales, on the borders of which he resided, and leaving home on Monday morning, on his little Welsh pony, he would pass from place to place, returning

on Saturday evening, having
absence sixteen or eighteen
as many thousands of hearers
however, he was for many ye
the clergy had contrived to
nant prejudice against "John
man at Shrewsbury," and
shepherds of the mountains
that of all men he was one
did Palmer talk and pray ov
length determined, at whatev
out-of-door sermon there. It
stance that he was personally
only in the district, and he re
lish the time and place of his
to erect a temporary pulpit.
the shepherds and peasants as
dreds, armed with clubs an
that "John Palmer, the Bapt
bury," should not preach there
met by his friends on the roa
to return, as his life was in da
them immediately to take ca
carriage, and to permit him t
only stipulating that when
ground no one should seem to
manner, with a most comman
attractive manners and dresse
tleman, he made his appearan
quire the cause of so large an
ple. "Why, *zur*," said they,
Baptist man from Shrewsb
and *zays* he 'll preach, but he s
said Palmer, "*he's* coming i
know him, *zur?*" "Know hi
I knew him forty years ago,
prentice to a doctor, and a str
is too." He then went on, tell
John Palmer and others, till
him, and became most intense
graphic and forcible sketches.

Bye and bye the stranger
John Palmer that you sai
preach? The answer was,
and nobody knew why. "We
a pity too, that there should b
will soon be dark." Well,
"Why," said he, "I shall be t
mer, and be insulted." Oh
guard him. He was at length
cend the pulpit, when he pro
was a solemn thing, they shoul
while he prayed; this conclude
and for about an hour preache
himself could preach to such an
awhile was silent as the grave,
jumping, and all the other si
Welsh show deep, intense feelin
midst of which the preacher sai
I am John Palmer, the Baptist
bury, what have you more to say
will you come and preach again
from all quarters. He often
again, and that "not in word
power and in the Holy Ghost, a
ance;" nor was his ministry
blessing.

on Saturday evening, having preached during his absence sixteen or eighteen sermons, to probably as many thousands of hearers. Into one locality, however, he was for many years unable to enter; the clergy had contrived to excite a most malignant prejudice against "John Palmer, the Baptist man at Shrewsbury," and the simple-hearted shepherds of the mountains were led to suppose that of all men he was one of the worst. Often did Palmer talk and pray over the spot; and at length determined, at whatever risk, to preach an out-of-door sermon there. It was a happy circumstance that he was personally known to one family only in the district, and he requested them to publish the time and place of his preaching, as well as to erect a temporary pulpit. The time came, and the shepherds and peasants assembled in many hundreds, armed with clubs and staves, determined that "John Palmer, the Baptist man from Shrewsbury," should not preach there. The preacher was met by his friends on the road, who entreated him to return, as his life was in danger. He requested them immediately to take care of his horse and carriage, and to permit him to take his own course, only stipulating that when he appeared on the ground no one should seem to know him. In this manner, with a most commanding person, highly attractive manners and dressed as a complete gentleman, he made his appearance, and began to inquire the cause of so large an assemblage of people. "Why, *zur*," said they, "John Palmer, the Baptist man from Shrewsbury, is coming here, and *zays* he 'll preach, but he *shanna*." "Oh, oh!" said Palmer, "*he's* coming is he?" "*Does* you know him, *zur?*" "Know him, to be sure I do. I knew him forty years ago, when he was an apprentice to a doctor, and a strange sort of man he is too." He then went on, telling them tales about John Palmer and others, till they all surrounded him, and became most intensely interested in his graphic and forcible sketches.

Bye and bye the stranger asked, But where's John Palmer that you said was coming to preach? The answer was, he was not come, and nobody knew why. "Well," said he, "that's a pity too, that there should be no preaching; it will soon be dark." Well, would he preach? "Why," said he, "I shall be taken for John Palmer, and be insulted." Oh, no! they would guard him. He was at length prevailed on to ascend the pulpit, when he proposed, as preaching was a solemn thing, they should take off their hats while he prayed; this concluded, he read his text, and for about an hour preached as few men besides himself could preach to such an audience. All for awhile was silent as the grave, weeping, groaning, jumping, and all the other signs by which the Welsh show deep, intense feeling, followed; in the midst of which the preacher said, "Now my lads, I am John Palmer, the Baptist man from Shrewsbury, what have you more to say to me?" "When will you come and preach again?" was the inquiry from all quarters. He often did preach there again, and that "not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance;" nor was his ministry unattended with a blessing.

THOUGHTS WORTH PONDERING.

"I can speak it from experience," says the celebrated Erasmus, "that there is little benefit derived from the Scriptures, if they be read curiously or carelessly; but if a man exercise himself therein constantly and conscientiously, he will find such an efficacy in them as is not to be found in any other book whatsoever."

"The genuine philosophy of Christ," says the same author, "cannot be derived from any source so successfully, as from the books of the Gospels and Apostolic Epistles; in which if a man philosophise with a pious spirit, praying rather than arguing, he will find that there is nothing conducive to the happiness of man, and the performance of any duty of human life, which is not in some of the writings laid down, discussed and determined, in a complete and satisfactory manner."

"That which stamps upon the Scriptures the highest value," says Bishop Porteus, "that which renders them, strictly speaking, inestimable, and distinguishes them from all other books in the world, is this: that they, and they only, contain the words of Eternal Life. In this respect, every other book, even the noblest compositions of man, must fail, they cannot give us that which we most want, and what is of infinitely more importance to us than all other things put together—*Eternal Life.*"

MATERNAL INSTRUCTION.—A good sensible mother is the greatest treasure of life. Her precepts live after death and enable us to resist temptation. Many a man owes his greatness to the early instruction of his mother, and the instances are rare of a wise and worthy mother having a bad son. The eccentric John Randolph had a partiality for French politics, and was accused af French atheism. "Indeed," said he, "I should have been a French atheist, if it had not been for one recollection, and that was the time when my departed mother used to take my little hands in hers, and cause me on my knees to say—'Our Father who art in heaven.'"

THE WIFE.—If you wish to be happy and have peace in the family, never reprove your husband in company—even if that reproof be ever so slight. If he be irritated, speak not an angry word. Indifference sometimes will produce unhappy consequences. Always feel an interest in what your husband undertakes, and if he is perplexed or discouraged, assist him by your smiles and happy words. If the wife is careful how she conducts, speaks and looks, a thousand happy hearts would cheer and brighten our existence, where now there is nothing but clouds of gloom, sorrow and discontent. The wife, above all others, should strive to please her husband, and to make home attractive.

BR. BLAIN'S stereotype plates—"*Death not Life*"—were destroyed by the fire. His loss is about one hundred dollars.

DELAY AND LOSS BY FIRE.—Our Examiner comes late to our subscribers by reason of the burning of the office where we had our printing done. This fire occurred when the EXAMINER was half set up; hence we had to begin again; causing more than a week's delay. Then we fitted up and started the work in our own office. Besides, a new lot of paper must be made, as ours is of a size not in the market.

We lost $80 worth of paper, and from $100 to $500 worth of stereotype plates. The exact amount of loss, in plates, we cannot yet tell, as they are still buried in the vault, or under the ruins. We know that the plates for the BIBLE EXAMINER *Extra*, or Quarto Six Sermons, are totally destroyed—*annihilated, as plates*. If immortal-soulists think otherwise, let them dig out the melted mass and see if they can *print* with it. These plates cost us $80 and were cast in 1843. We suppose some fifty thousand copies of the Six Sermons have been printed on them.

We presume about $50 worth of Tract Plates are lost. And we fear the plates of Ham's two works are also gone; but of this we are not yet certain. Those plates cost us about $150.

The plates of the "*Bible* vs. *Tradition*," are in the ruins, but we hope not destroyed. The Printer says, they were put into the vault; if so, they may come out safe; though there is no doubt but what some plates in the vault have been injured, as it was so damaged as to have been unsafe to enter it; hence we do not know the extent of our loss. These plates cost about $230.

The whole value of paper and plates we had in the fire was about $600. Near $200 we know is lost; the rest, at present uncertain. All the *insurance* we had was on high and in the hearts of our friends.

Our paper comes to you in a new dress throughout—type—rules—head, and all, are new. An additional expense has thus been incurred of about $250, for printing materials.

As our plates are gone for the *Quarto Six Sermons*, no more of that work can be had of us, except a few at *retail* price, *viz:* 5 cents. We happened to have a small quantity on hand.

RECEIPTS to aid the Editor of the EXAMINER: H. E. C., $2. Roswell Hart, $2. Jacob Grim, $8. Sister Grieveson, $2. Church in Philadelphia, $25. D. B. Salter, $5. Marcus Doremus, $1. Patrick Cannon, $3. John B. Dodge, $3.

THE EXAMINER, for April 1st, will appear with the least possible delay.

"BIBLE *vs.* TRADITION, in which the true teaching of the Bible is manifested, the Corruptions of Theologians detected and the Traditions of Men exposed. By AARON ELLIS. Revised and much enlarged by THOS. READ, New York. Bible Examiner Office, 1853, pp. 309.

"So far as we have perused this extensive treatise, it seems to us distinguished by no ordinary merits. It is a work of immense patience and labor;—it is one adapted for signal usefulness. It explains the scriptural ideas of Soul, Spirit, the State of the Dead, the End of the Wicked, and the Hope of Immortality, as the portions of believers only. These are the chief topics handled, and with an exhaustiveness of evidence and transparency of elucidation, admirably fitted to satisfy inquiring minds. Had the volume been a little more philosophical in its construction, a higher value would have been given to it; as it is, the worth of it is very great, and we anticipate in mind the day when such treatises will be easily re-published in our own land, where tradition holds a firm and terrible sway."—*Moncrieff's Expositor, Edinburgh.*

We trust the work spoken of by Br. Moncrieff will be more widely circulated than ever. Price 75 cents; or, ten copies for $5. There have been four editions published. We hope the stereotype plates of the work may come out of the ruins of the late fire safe; but we have no certainty about that yet.

"THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—This is the title of a semi-monthly periodical published in New York; Geo. Storrs, editor and proprietor. If we understand its object, it is to advocate the notions that the ordeal we call death, is a total extinction of all being, both physical and spiritual; and that a similar death will be the doom of the finally impenitent, after the resurrection. Its motto is: '*No immortality nor endless life except through Jesus Christ alone.*' What does Mr. Storrs mean by this? Does he mean that there is no conscious being between death and the resurrection; nor to the wicked after the general judgment? Will Mr. Storrs please answer?"

The foregoing we clip from the *Christian Union*, edited by Edward E. Orvis, at New London, Pa. We think if Bro. Orvis has read the EXAMINER for the past year, as it has been sent in exchange for that time, he would not need to have asked his question. We most certainly mean that when *the man* is dead he is not alive: and "the wages of sin is death," saith the Word of Truth. If Bro. Orvis, or any one else, can make death the same as eternal *preservation* in torture, then he may wonder "What does Mr. Storrs mean?"

THE FINAL REPORT of the *Prov. Com.*, through unavoidable hindrances, could not be made ready for this number, as we promised. It will appear at the earliest possible period.

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY, N

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED SE

At No. 130 I

TERMS---One Do

Always in

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR

AN AP

TO MEN OF REASON

Friends: If you lay c
acteristics, then give att
points:—

1. Is it reasonable to s
man an immortal being, a
holy word informed us of

2. Is it reasonable to s
rally possessed immortali
commend us to seek for it

3. Is it reasonable to s
naturally immortal, God'
assure us that "God—o
1 Tim. 6 : 16.

4. Is it not far more r
immortality is the GIFT
Christ our Lord? Rom.

5. Is it reasonable to s
found in the Bible, *must*
to them, which no man
think of attaching to th
For instance—the words
found in the Bible, *must*,
mean *happiness* and *mise*
other book in the world,
istence" and "Cessation

6. Is it reasonable to
vast multitude of passage
ised LIFE, ETERNAL LIFE
did not *literally* mean
could not, if all men have
In that case the wicked
as well as the righteous.

7. Is it reasonable to
multitude of passages in
ened as the punishment o
happiness is all that is me
is as truly *alive* as the mo
ence; and if he be immo
tinue *alive* through all ete
mon sense, can an immort
DEATH.

8. Is it reasonable to s
dom would invariably u
only calculated to mislea
none but Doctors of

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, APRIL 1, 1854. NO. 7.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

AN APPEAL.

TO MEN OF REASON AND COMMON SENSE.

Friends: If you lay claim to the above characteristics, then give attention to the following points:—

1. Is it reasonable to suppose, that God created man an immortal being, and yet never once in his holy word informed us of the fact?

2. Is it reasonable to suppose, that if man naturally possessed immortality, God's word would recommend us to seek for it, as it does in Rom. 2:7?

3. Is it reasonable to suppose, that if men were naturally immortal, God's word would so plainly assure us that "God—ONLY hath immortality?" 1 Tim. 6:16.

4. Is it not far more reasonable to believe that immortality is the GIFT of God through Jesus Christ our Lord? Rom. 6:23.

5. Is it reasonable to suppose that words, when found in the Bible, *must* have a meaning attached to them, which no man in his senses would ever think of attaching to them in any other book? For instance—the words LIFE and DEATH, when found in the Bible, *must*, (as Theologians tell us,) mean *happiness* and *misery;* but, if found in any other book in the world, would simply mean "Existence" and "Cessation of Existence."

6. Is it reasonable to suppose that, in all the vast multitude of passages in which Christ promised LIFE, ETERNAL LIFE, to his followers, that he did not *literally* mean what he said? This he could not, if all men have immortal life by nature. In that case the wicked will *live* through eternity, as well as the righteous.

7. Is it reasonable to suppose, in all the vast multitude of passages in which DEATH is threatened as the punishment of the sinner, that *loss of happiness* is all that is meant? An unhappy man is as truly *alive* as the most happy being in existence; and if he be immortal by nature, will continue *alive* through all eternity. In no *plain, common sense,* can an immortal being be said to suffer DEATH.

8. Is it reasonable to suppose that Infinite Wisdom would invariably use language which was only calculated to mislead his creatures? or which none but Doctors of Divinity could unravel? Would God speak in riddles to men, in the great matters which concern their salvation?

9. Is it not more reasonable, and more in accordance with the wisdom and love of God, to suppose, that he would give his creatures such a revelation, as plain common-sense people could easily understand? He has done so:—if men would but use their reason in reading the Bible, as they would do in reading any other book.

10. Is it reasonable to believe, that men go to Heaven or Hell immediately at death; and then, hundreds or thousands of years afterward take them out again to be judged, and to see which they deserve to be sent to? Should we deem it right to send a man to the State's Prison for ten years, and then bring him out for trial, to see if he deserved such a punishment? And, "Shall not the Judge of the whole earth do right?"

11. Is it reasonable, that such prominence should be given in scripture to the doctrine of a Resurrection from the dead, if that event only means a "re-union" of a lump of clay, with the *conscious, thinking and real* man—THE SOUL: and which is said by Theologians, to be as capable of happiness or misery without the Body, as with it?

12. Is it reasonable to talk about a "Death that never dies," when there is not a word in scripture to sanction such a contradictory phrase? Would it not be equally reasonable to speak of the reward of the righteous as a "Life that never lives?" Is there not as much common sense in the one, as in the other?

13. Is it reasonable to be so constantly, both in sermons and prayers, talking about "Immortal souls"—"Never dying souls"—"Deathless spirits"—and such like expressions, when there is not, from Genesis to Revelation, *one single passage* to warrant the use of such language?

14. Is it reasonable to say, that "Eternal Death," and "Eternal Torment, are synonymous expressions," (as Theologians tell us)—for how then can it be said, in Rev. 21:4, "There shall be NO more death"?

15. Is it reasonable to believe, that a hell of fiery torment, and ceaseless misery is to exist for ever, when God says, Rev. 21:5, "Behold I make ALL things new"?

16. Is it reasonable to believe that a God of Infinite love and mercy would ever have given life to a being whom he foresaw would be miserable to all eternity?

17. Is it reasonable to believe in the Eternal Torment of the Wicked, when more than two hundred passages of scripture plainly affirm that they shall "DIE"—be "CONSUMED"—"DEVOURED"—"DESTROYED"—"BURNT UP"—"BE AS THOUGH THEY HAD NOT BEEN," &c., &c.

18. Is it reasonable to believe that the righteous, in their glorified state, can be indifferent to, and unaffected by, the endless sufferings of countless millions of their fellow beings; among whom would probably be found parents, children, husbands, wives, &c.? Is it possible that they will be destitute or deprived of qualities which are considered most lovely and Godlike in this life—viz.: pity, sympathy, compassion, commiseration for others' woes, &c.? Will insensibility to the woes of the wretched ever become a virtue? Will that which is a vice in this life become a grace in the glorious future life? Is the standard of virtue thus variable, that what is vicious here is to be gracious hereafter?

19. Is it reasonable to believe that a God of Infinite Rectitude will punish with Eternal Torment, the Heathen who have never heard of Christ, and who therefore *could* not reject him? Is it possible that God can cast into one indiscriminate mass of fiery torment, the least wicked among the heathen, together with the most guilty in this Christian land? for such must be the case if their souls are immortal, and if their torment is to be eternal. There can be no degrees in that which is infinite. Is it not far more reasonable to believe the Apostle's words *literally*, "For as many have sinned without law shall also PERISH without law."—Rom. 2 : 12.

20. Is it reasonable to believe that God is such a vindictive being, that his justice *cannot* be satisfied with the *death* of the offender? but that he must be constantly pouring floods of fiery wrath upon the wretched being through the ever rolling cycles of Eternity?

I might multiply questions of this kind, but I forbear.

Men of reason and common sense, give your serious attention to these points. Read your Bibles again. Read carefully—read prayerfully. See if these things be true or not. Dare to think for yourselves. If other men should attempt to dictate a political creed for you, would you not indignantly spurn their interference? Do the same in religious matters. Dare to be independent. Do not trust to commentaries. Do not build your faith on "Bodies of Divinity." Do not surrender your right of private judgment to any class of men. Go at once to the fountain head of truth. "The words of the Lord are tried words." "The law of the Lord is perfect." This cannot be said of the writings or opinions of any man, or number of men, however wise or holy they may be. To err is human. God and his truth, alone are infallible. Show yourselves *true* Protestants, and cast away the "Traditions of men." You have the Bible. The wisest and holiest of the "Fathers" had no more. Your ministers have nothing else to guide them—at least they *ought* not. "The Bible, and the Bible alone, is the book for Protestants." Go then to your Bibles, and see if the God-dishonoring doctrines to which I have directed your attention are found there or not. Excuse me if I tell you, that, however full of these doctrines human books and human sermons may be, GOD'S BIBLE does not contain them.

Rather believe that man is MORTAL, and condemned to DIE, but Christ is "Come that men may have LIFE, and that they may have it more abundantly."—John 10 : 10.

"The wages of sin is DEATH, but the gift of God is ETERNAL LIFE through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Rom. 6 : 23.

"He that believeth on the Son hath EVERLASTING LIFE; and he that believeth not the Son shall NOT SEE LIFE; but the wrath of God abideth on him."—John 3 : 36.

"And I give unto them ETERNAL LIFE; and they shall never PERISH, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."—John 10 : 28.

"He that hath the Son hath LIFE; and he that hath not the Son of God hath NOT LIFE."—1 John 5 : 12.

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their *graves* shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of LIFE; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of DAMNATION."—John 5 : 28, 29.

"And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the JUST and UNJUST."—Acts 24 : 15.

"The Lord knoweth how—to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished."—1 Pet. 2 : 9.

"And they were judged every man according to their work. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire—THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH."—Rev. 20 : 13, 14.

"THE IMPERATIVE NATURE OF DUTY."—Such is the title of a sermon "By C. F. Hudson," which has kindly been sent us by the author. We have read it with much interest and satisfaction, and wish it a wide circulation. In its general character it is most excellent. We might dissent from a few expressions; which, however, may express the truth more clearly than any substitute of ours. Br. Hudson's sermon is an octavo pamphlet of about twenty pages. Whether he has them for sale we do not know. We give the following extract from the first part of it.

—

"All ungodliness, and all habitual immorality, is practical atheism. And however much the theories of atheists may differ, they are agreed in this—to practice the requirements of right and duty, only so far as it may suit their feelings or their convenience. Just this it is that makes them to be what they are. And accordingly Plato reckons as belonging to the one class of atheist, three different sorts of people: 1st, those who deny altogether the being of a God; 2dly, those who allow His being, but deny His providence, or that He takes note of the conduct of men; and, 3dly, those who confess that God does mark the actions and characters of men, but still think that He can be easily persuaded by their entreaties or their propitiatory sacrifices, to forego the claims of His law, and to forbear punishing their misdeeds. They are willing to disobey the divine requirement; they prefer to

seek their own pleasure, even though they shall do wrong. But fearing that the penalty of their disobedience is severer than they would like to incur, they seek to avert it by certain pains-taking, in the way of prayers, and sacrifices, and penances. And I would call your especial attention to the last sort of atheists, as the Greek philosopher esteems them, because their feeling is so allied to that of which I wish to speak. They dread to endure what they regard as their just punishment; and they endeavor to escape it, not by a change of heart and life, but by self-inflicted and voluntary pains and losses, which they offer to God as a substitute for the pains which He threatens. Thus, like the colonists whom the Assyrian king sent to the conquered land of Samaria, they 'fear the Lord,' and still 'serve their own gods.' Now this is precisely the nature of penance, as something distinct from repentance. It is not a sorrow for sin, but a fear of its consequences. Instead of producing a change of heart and a godly life, it is a sorrow of the world, that worketh death. Just here, too, lies the difference between religion and superstition. The one is a sense of obligation and duty to God, the other is a sheer dread of the penalty of duty neglected and disliked. Hence the austerities which the Hindoo devotee inflicts upon himself, are perfectly consistent with the vices of his life, because his object is, not to make his own heart and character better, but to better his case, or to make himself better off with his God. This it is that distinguishes all corrupt systems of worship—an abundance of rites and ceremonies and outward observances, which shall make one less afraid to indulge in sin. And even in the common life and intercourse of men, there are frequent exhibitions of the same feeling. Often when one has wronged his fellow, instead of humble and frank confession and reparation, he makes himself wretched with secret and cherished self-reproach, with which he hopes to punish himself, and tries to soothe the wounded and morbid pride of his heart. Just so, in their relation to God's law, persons under conviction of sin often cherish a purposed and continued sorrow, as though they might thus do something to atone for their transgressions, and avert the divine displeasure. All such self-imposed pains and sorrows are, in their essential nature, penances of superstition, as ungodly in fact as any other form of atheism, and ever sternly rebuked in God's Word. Thus when Balak, seeking an occasion against God's people, thought to gain His favor with burnt offerings, he was told that with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil, he could not please a Being whom he would not obey. 'Shall I then,' he asks, 'give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?' 'He hath showed thee, O man, what is good,' replies the unwilling prophet, 'and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.'—Micah 6 : 6–8. And when Saul would avert the loss of his kingdom for his disobedience, by making choice sacrifices, Samuel would urge upon his conscience this plain truth: 'Hath the Lord as as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams.'—1 Sam. 15 : 22. Such is the nature of all superstition and penance; they are the instinctive resort of a guilty soul, that dreads the punishment it deserves, and is still unwilling to repent. And just the opposite of this was the feeling of the penitent Psalmist: 'Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou will not despise.' —Ps. 51 : 16, 17.

"Thus have I endeavored to describe that superstitious form of atheism which dreads punishment, and imposes voluntary pains or penances as a substitute for it, though one is all the while unwilling to obey God, and seeks to do his own pleasure. For will-worship and superstition are only different phases of the same perverseness of soul. And such is human nature, that the unregenerate man man would gladly enjoy the pleasures of waywardness and sin, and then be free from the penalty of his guilt."

DEFENCE OF THE BIBLE.

In the EXAMINER for Jan. 15, we gave our first speech in defence of the Bible at the Hartford Convention. March 15 we gave our last in that Convention. We now give our third. We spoke as follows:—

The Bible is on trial, charged with the blackest crimes. We have called for the rule by which the Bible is to be tried, and we are told that that rule is natural religion, or, in other words, the religion of nature. I do not know that there has been any receding. My friend Wright said very distinctly, that the rule by which the Bible was to be tried was the religion of nature. If they recede from that position, I have no objection certainly; but it is manifest that there must be some rule. Now to say that the rule is in the Bible itself, is to say that the criminal is to be judged by himself. (Cries of hear, hear.) It is taken for granted that he is a criminal. Now what law has he violated? Has he violated the religion of nature? I wish it to be distinctly understood with regard to myself, as I have before said, I do not stand here to contend that everything written in the Bible is inspired of God. That is not my position. I do not stand here to say that every sentiment that is uttered in the Bible is approved of by the God of the Bible. I do not stand here to affirm, when a certain character said, "Thou shalt not surely die," that that was inspired by God. No, it was a libel upon God. I said last evening, that I conceived that the true question should be, not is the Bible a revelation from God, but is the Bible a true *history* of revelations given to men in times past, and does it contain a true record of transactions connected with these revelations? As I have already said, the truth of that position depends upon the credibility of the witnesses; but I am not going to argue that point again tonight. What does the resolution charge upon the

Bible? Who has ever said that the Bible, "*as a whole*," emanated from God? I have just quoted one text that is recorded there that did not emanate from God, but from his enemy. The objection, however, that is urged against the Bible—the crime that is charged upon the Bible, is not a new one. It is substantially the same that has been urged by many eminent men prior to this day. We here give you a quotation from Lord Bolingbroke. He says:—

"The God of Moses is partial, unjust, cruel (hear, hear); delights in blood, commands assassinnation, massacres, and even exterminations of people, etc. (Hear, hear.) The God of Paul elects some of his creatures to salvation, and predestinates others to damnation, even in their mothers' wombs. If there was not a Being infinitely more perfect than these, there would be no God at all, nor any true religion in the world. But there is most assuredly such a Being, and he who proposes any system of religion wherein this all-perfect being is not to be found, may say he is not an Atheist, but can not say with truth that he is a Theist."—Works, vol. v., p. 600.

Here you perceive substantially the same argument. It is not a new one. How is the Bible tried by natural religion—the religion of nature? By contrasting it with the character of the God of nature? If I have misstated the question, I have not intended to. I have not come here with any feeling of quarreling in my heart. (Hear, hear.) I am almost prepared to say from my very heart, that I respect the Deists because they have rejected the Bible; they having been taught that that the Bible teaches certain doctrines, which I am satisfied are not to be found in it, but originated in the perverse understanding of men. Now, sir, we are going to test the God of the Bible by the God of nature, and see how the God of the Bible stands by this law in respect to the God of Nature. Now shut up the Bible and look at the God of natnre. The God of nature is cruel. What, "the God of nature!" Yes, sir, outrageously cruel, barbarously cruel. "How do you prove that charge?" Go yonder, sir; see where that city stood. All were in the enjoyment of blessings and sympathy of friendship, rejoicing in each other's love, the love of society, and the God of nature marched through by his earthquake, shook the foundation of the city, and buried them in ruin! Is the God of the Bible worse than that? What has he done worse? (Applause.) Here is a populous country that spreads itself along the pleasant river, and the fields are whitening for the harvest. The inhabitants dwelling along the borders of that river are flourishing and in prosperity. Their families are happy; but the God of nature pours down the waters, and the river rises and swells, and sweeps away their dwellings, and destroys the inhabitants. Ah! did the God of the Bible do anything worse than that? Come, God of nature, stand up and defend yourself. We charge you with being a cruel God. (Applause.) We see men spread abroad over the land, pursuing the business of life, and not interfering with the God of nature; but the God of nature travels along throug the country with the cholera, and calls of thousands upon thousands. Does he not sanction "wholesale murder?" We are trying the Bible by the God of nature, and I will ask you, as a jury sitting on the trial, if, so far, the God of nature is not likely to be quite as bad as the God of the Bible? But, sir, we do not stop here—we go further. You complain, perhaps, that the God of the Bible authorized Moses to exterminate whole nations—wholesale murder you may call it, if you please. How has the God of nature acted in this respect? I beg leave again to refer to Bolingbroke. It is in his views on the subject of evil, in his Works, vol. v., pp. 403, 404. He says:—

"True it is that men are sometimes involved in general calamities, which they can neither foresee nor prevent, such as inundations, earthquakes, pestilences, and the entire devastations of kingdoms or provinces by savage and barbarous people, like the Huns of old, or the Spaniards, in later ages. But these calamities are rare. They may be considered as chastisements, for chastisements are reasonable when there are any to be amended by partaking of them, or by being at least spectators of them. They may be considered as mere effects, natnral, though contingent of matter and motion in a material system, put in motion under certain general laws. If they are seen in the first light (*i. e.* chastisements), they should teach mankind to adore and to fear that Providence which governs the world by particular as well as by general dispensations. If they are seen in the second (*i. e.* as mere effects, etc.), they should suggest some other reflections which are not without their utility neither." On page 438, Bolingbroke says:—"Cotta, who exercises greater injustice toward God than any of the tyrants he quotes did toward men, is much scandalized that those two eyes of the Mediterranean coast, *Corinth* and *Carthage*, were put out, etc. But how did he know that Mummius and Scipio (the Roman genenals by whom these cities were destroyed) were not instruments of the justice of Providence, as well as of Roman policy and passion? The worst men, and the Romans were none of the best, are employed to punish the worst. None so fitted to the task. They are the instruments, and in their turn the examples of divine justice. The wealth, the splendor, the magnificence of Corinth were great, but Corinth was a sink of iniquity.

Carthage was a great and powerful state, but the Carthaginians were a faithless, factious, and cruel people. Might not these be the remote and true causes (of the judgment of God upon them), whatever the immediate and apparent were of their destruction ?"

Now, sir, here is one who is talking of the God of nature. He admits it right, and undertakes to justify the God of nature in suffering those two eyes of the Mediterranean Sea to be put out. For what reason ? "Why," says he, "they were abominably corrupt." Therefore the God of nature was justified in causing them to be destroyed, and destroyed, too, by the wickedest of men. Now I ask this intelligent congregation, whether the cases are not parallel with the God of the Bible ; and whether the God of the Bible is to be condemned by the God of nature. What was the reason which the God of the Bible himself assigns, why Abraham was not yet to passess the land of Canaan ? Why his postcrity were to be kept out of that land for centuries to come ? Turn to the Bible itself and hear what it says, Genesis 15 : 13–16. After speaking to Abraham of the bondage of his children in Egypt, He says, "But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again." Now mark, "For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." What is that, sir ? Why, the God of the Bible did not allow Abraham to possess that land, or injure its inhabitants, far the reason that their iniquity was not yet full ; but when it was full—as Lord Bolingbroke says, the iniquity of Carthage and Corinth was full—then, sir, the God of the Bible did the same thing that the God of nature did.

Now, sir, how are you going to condemn the God of the Bible by the God of nature ? Whoever will take the history of the world will find that the God of nature has suffered and countenanced the same crimes which it is affirmed the God of the Bible has ; and without spending time to go into details, we will say that the God of nature has countenanced, sanctioned, and sustained exterminating war, Lord Bolingbroke himself being witness on the subject ; so the God of nature is a "wholesale murderer." Sir, if the God of the Bible was, so is the God of nature ; and once judged by that law, the Bible stands at least on an equality with the God of nature, or with natural religion, if you like the expression better.

But, sir, why is it that there must be a disposition or inclination on the part of some on this question to foist upon the God of the Bible certain doctrines which the Bible never taught, and never does teach ? I am of opinion, as at the outset, that the question first of all to be settled is, not whether the Bible is a revelation of God, but whether it is a faithful history of revelations made at different times to different persons under different circumstances, and a faithful history of transactions connected with those revelations ? Now, sir, we take a transaction which was referred to last evening, and yesterday. My friend Pillsbury asked me last night why I would not take up the case of the slave whipped to death ? Now, sir, we are going to turn to that text. Did my friend Barker intend to insinuate to this congregation that the God of the Bible sanctioned the whipping of a slave to death, and because he was the money of the master, the master was not to be punished for it ?

Mr. Barker—I said that the Bible lays down the principle, that if a man whip his man-servant or his maid-servant, so that the servant *dies*, if the servant does no die the same day, then the master shall not be punished ; and the reason assigned by this passage is, "because he is his money."

Mr. Storrs—Now, sir, we will read the passage, mark you—the question was, whether the God of the Bible sanctions the murder of a slave ? "And if a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished ;" and what is the punishment ? "He is his money, and must not be hurt !" Just let the Scriptures explain themselves and get their own testimony. The same chapter, twelfth verse, says, "He that smiteth a man so that he die, shall be surely put to death." That is the plain statement. "But, perhaps," says one, "that does not exactly prevent his smiting a slave so that he dies."

Mr. Barker—Does Mr. Storrs mean to say that he has read the whole passage referring to the smiting to death a servant ?

Mr. Storrs—No, not now ; I am coming to it by and by. Turn to Deuteronomy, 19th chapter. Here are provisions made, that in case a man slew his neighbor, not intending his death, he might, by fleeing to a city of refuge, be preserved from death, if it was a manifest fact that he did not intend to kill him ; but the person could not be saved from punishment where there was any intention of killing. Mark the law : "But if any man hate his neighbor, and rise up against and smite him that he die, and fleeth into one of these cities, then the elders of the city shall send and bring him thence, and deliver him into the hand of the avenger of blood, that he may die. Thine eye shall not pity him, but thou shalt put away the guilt of innocent blood from Israel, that it may go well with thee."

Now, sir, I ask, if the law does not clearly specify that in case a person intends to kill another, there should be no such thing as deliverance? but he should die. That was the penalty. We come back again to the 21st chapter of Exodus. You have seen that this man who is supposed to have a pecuniary interest in his man-servant or maid-servant is found chastising or whipping them for some supposed, imaginary, or real offense. Why, says the law, "If he die under his hand he shall be surely punished;" and the punishment is, "he shall surely die for it." But says the following verse, "and notwithstanding if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money." Did you ever hear of manslaughter? What is the punishment spoken of in the text? *Death.* Well, now, this person who has thus inflicted upon a man-servant or maid-servant chastisement, or punishment, or whipping, so that after a day or two he dies, it is supposed, from the nature of the case, that he did not intend to take the life of his servant; therefore the punishment which had been specified beforehand was not to be inflicted upon him. I ask if this is not the case in modern days with our laws? Does not the law call it manslaughter, where a man lingers along a day or two after he is injured, and where it is proved that the one injuring him did not intend to take his life. The very fact that the master has an interest in the servant is *prima facie* evidence that he did not intend to take his life; and therefore is an evidence that he did not intend to commit murder. The impression has been made that the Bible sanctions such a servitude as American slavery; but we have in the chapter before us now—"and if a man smite the eye of his servant or the eye of his maid that it perish, he shall let him go out free for his eye's sake."

He was punished for striking out his eye by the loss of all pecuniary interest, whatever it was. "And if he smite his man-servant's tooth, or his maid-servant's tooth, he shall let him go free for his tooth's sake"—for loss of a tooth. Pretty good punishment, was it not? that he should be obliged to lose the property that he had in his servant? Therefore you see that the law guards against injury in inflicting punishment upon these servants. I say, then, sir, that the reason why he should not be punished *with death* is a good reason; and the principle is admitted in the administration of common law under our own government—the principle that circumstances may show that the man did not intend to kill. Here, then, sir, we conceive that the God of the Bible is not so bad as they have charged him to be in this particular.

"WHAT IS SPIRITUAL LIFE?" Also, "*Doctrine according to Godliness*:—The moral and spiritual tendencies of the doctrine, that Life and Immortality are, and can be, possessed only in Christ. A Sequel to What is Spiritual Life?"

The foregoing are the titles of two pamphlets, "by W. Morris," and printed in London in 1849. We have recently received them from the author, who now resides in the State of Ohio.

We shall give occasional extracts from these works, which will show their character. We give the following at this time.

—

In endeavoring to supply an answer, from the oracles of God, to the question, "What is spiritual life?" we observe:—

I. Spiritual life, considered in its radical principle, is the "incorruptible seed," the "seed" of God.—1 Peter 1 : 23; 1 John 3 : 9.

The apostle John distinguishes between the entire persons of the children of God, and that living and spiritual principle, or substance, by virtue of which they are sons of God. In so doing he speaks of "*Who*soever is born of God," and also of "*What*soever is born of God." And the ideas of these distiuguishable but inseparable realities (*i. e.* the seminal principle of spiritual life, and the person to whom that principle has been communicated), are by him thus presented:—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for *His seed* remaineth in him; and he cannot sin because he is born of God."

Man is a corruptible *being*, and the children of men are born "of corruptible seed." But God is the incorruptible God, and his children are born again "of incorruptible seed, by or through the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever." It is most certain that the truth of the gospel is the instrument through which they are begotton again; but *that* truth is inseparable from the person of the Incarnate Word who is "the Truth." The truth of the gospel is living truth, purely by virtue of its being identified with the living "WORD of God,"—"the Word of life." Therefore, while the truth of the gospel is the medium of spiritual generation, and may be thus regarded as instrumentally conveying the seminal principle of spiritual life, it would be most unwise to confound in our minds the spiritual instrument of conveyance, with the incorruptible seed of God, who "is SPIRIT."

II. Spiritual life, in itself considered, *is spirit;* John 3 : 6, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Our Lord, before uttering this divine statement, said to Nicodemus, that, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see (perceive) the kingdom of God." He had thus spoken of the necessity of a new, a second and spiritual birth; and he had thus expressed his ideas of both analogy and contrast; analogy in respect to natural generation, as the origin and commencement of natural existence; and contrast in respect to spiritual generation, as the origin and commencement of spiritual *being*.

When he said, "That which is born of the flesh

is flesh," he included in that saying the entireness of man's natural *being*, and also the evil moral qualities and mortal condition entailed by human generation. And when he thus spoke of the procreative energy, and of the offspring of the flesh, he used no metaphor nor figure of speech. Neither did he employ any figure of speech when he added, "and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." A contrast, both physical and moral, is intended and expressed, between the offspring of "the Spirit" and the offspring of "the flesh."

When the Divine Teacher had said to Nicodemus, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again," he added, "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; *so is every one who is born of the Spirit.*" He had before spoken of a new and spiritual element of personal *being*—"that which is born of the Spirit;" and he here speaks of the *persons* who, by virtue of that new element, are declared to be themselves "born of the Spirit;" and of them he affirms, that they are incomprehensible by the intelligence and wisdom of the natural mind. It may possibly be thought that, in the above passage, our Lord is speaking of the mysteriousness of the Holy Spirit's operations, and that it is these he affirms to be incomprehensible; but his words are, "So is *every one* who is born of the Spirit." And as a manifest evidence of the truth of this statement, the unintelligent reply of Nicodemus was, "How can these things be?" His former question arose from his having supposed a second *natural* birth to have been spoken of; but this mistake was immediately corrected. Our Lord showed him that he did in truth speak of the necessity of a second birth, but of a birth which is both new and spiritual. This necessity he enforced, by saying, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." He intimated that this doctrine ought not to have excited the wonder of one who was himself a teacher of Israel, and, as such, a leader of the popular mind in the paths of reputed orthodoxy. And he further affirmed, as before noticed, that "every one who is born of the Spirit," is a *being* who is incomprehensible by mere human intelligence. But the perplexity and amazement of Nicodemus were only, and greatly so, increased by this fuller statement of the doctrine of spiritual regeneration; and hence his unenlightened reply—his sceptical exclamation.

Nicodemus was a Pharisee and a teacher of Israel, and may be deemed to have been acquainted with the writings of the prophets. In those writings God had made promises to Israel of "a new heart," and "a new spirit." He had also, in some instances, used similitudes to describe the moral qualities, and the experimental and practical effects of that same "new spirit." But Nicodemus had not, in respect to those promises, distinguished between a spiritual substance and its moral qualities, nor between real and inward causes and their corresponding effects. He had taken all those passages in the writings of the prophets to be simply metaphorical, that is, if he had at all regarded them; and he held them to denote "a great moral change," supposed to consist in "a re-adjustment of the faculties of the human soul." He had never learned that "the flesh profiteth nothing;" and that, however wrought up and modified, it is still *flesh* and not *spirit*. Therefore, when he fully knew that the Divine Teacher inculcated the doctrine of a second—a new and spiritual birth, he was filled with wonder. (Wonder has been described to be "the effect of novelty upon ignorance," and as "an effect produced on a *senseless* imagination excited by a *strong* cause.") But had Nicodemus understood our Lord to speak of a metaphorical second birth—a moral change in the state and activities of the human soul, rather than a new and spiritual element of personal being—this, doubtless, would have been no such novelty to his mind, as to have excited his wondering incredulity. His philosophy could undoubtedly have mastered the conception of such a "great change;" but the utmost exercise of his natural wisdom could not comprehend "one who is born of the Spirit."

His confusion of thought and of feeling was perfectly known to the Divine Teacher; but he did not seek to relieve his perplexed inquirer, and to reduce the mental chaos to order and harmony, by intimating that his words were to be taken figuratively, and not literally. He only added to the force and effects of his previous statements; and, at the same time, conveyed to the mind of Nicodemus a keen but merciful rebuke. As calling in question his ministerial competency, and reproving his ignorance and unbelief, He "answered and said unto him, *Art thou a teacher of Israel, and knowest not these things?* Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness."

I LOOK TO THEE.

My wayward heart hath followed many a fancy,
Hugged many a phantom in its secret cell,
Wasted bright, sunny hours in idly musing,
Yet pondered of the art of living well.

But of my little self now grown distrustful,
From its deep scrutiny I turn away,
To find my purest thoughts have still of evil,
My highest aspirations tinged with clay.

From the darkest chaos of intensest feeling,
Tired of sin's shackles, struggling to be free,
With all my faults and earth-hopes round me clinging,
Father, most merciful, I look to Thee.

I look to Thee, blest Saviour, all prevailing,
Thy rainbow promise through the cloud I see,
Nearer and still more near by faith approaching,
Soon may I merge my feeble all in Thee.

Zion's Herald.

THE DEVIL'S AIM.—The Devil's Aim is to strike every man with Spiritual Blindness. The eagle, before he setteth himself upon the hart, rolleth himself in the sand, and then flyeth at the stag's head, and by fluttering his wings, so dusteth his eyes that he can see nothing, and so striketh

him with his talons where he listeth. Now the sand and the dust, with which the Devil filleth his wings, are earthly desires, and sensual pleasures, wherewith after he has put out the eyes of the carnal man, he dealeth with him at his pleasure.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL 1, 1854.

"MATERIALISM."—Dialogue continued from the EXAMINER of Feb. 1st.

N. D. GEORGE.—"The Destructionists will have it that the expressions *perish* and *destroy*, when used in reference to the sinner, are to be understood in a strictly literal sense, that they mean annihilation. To show the falsity of this, let us apply this rule to a passage or two. Job says of God, (9 : 22,) '*He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked.*' By the perfect, as contrasted with the wicked, the righteous are meant of course, and these two classes include the whole race of man. The whole race, then, are to be struck out of existence! Again Job says (24 : 15,) '*All flesh shall perish together.*' The whole of Adam's race, then, are to be annihilated."

EXAMINER.—"To show the falsity" of your effort in these remarks, we observe, first—You have not truly represented our views. We say, when the terms perish and destroy, are used in relation to the "*final doom*" of the sinner, they are to be taken in a strictly literal sense, unless the immortality of the sinner is first established: such immortality never has been, and, we believe never can be, established by any argumentation either from Scripture or philosophy. On your side of the question, you maintain that *perish* and *destroy*, when used in reference to the wicked, mean "eternal misery." Let us apply this rule to your texts from Job. "He destroyeth the perfect and the wicked." That "includes the whole race of man," you say. "The whole race, then, are to be" eternally miserable! "Again Job says, '*All flesh shall perish together.*' The whole of Adam's race, then, are to be" *eternally tormented!* Thus, friend George, your illustrations recoil on your own system and prove universal damnation, and you come out a Universalist; but of the most horrible kind. We know, and have always maintained, that all words are sometimes used in a figurative and restricted sense; but it is not difficult to judge when that is the case. The circumstances and necessity of the case will determine that. No such necessity exists in the use of the terms under consideration, when applied to the final doom of wicked men, unless you can demonstrate that such persons are immortal: but not one text in the Bible saith "the soul is immortal," or that man possesses an immortal nature: *no, not one.* Till you have settled that point you do nothing but *assume;* and you must not expect us to bow to your *ipse-dixit.*

GEO.—"In the Scriptures the terms *destroy* and *perish*, with their derivatives, are often used to denote, not the second, but the first death. Now, if these terms are to be understood literally, then such as die this first death go to nothing, which precludes the possibility of a resurrection, for to talk of the resurrection of *nothing* is to talk without meaning."

EXR.—The terms, then, "denote *death.*" Thank you for that admission, for it demolishes your whole argument. It is death—deprivation of life—according to yourself. The going "to nothing" is another matter. It is not difficult to see how a person can be deprived of life, sensibility, or consciousness, and yet not be "nothing." But do not your side of the question talk of God's creating "all things out of *nothing*"? Much more, we think, than to say, God can revive a *dead man*, who has remained in an unconscious state for any number of years. The fact is, We believe the Scriptures clearly teach that "there is no knowledge" in the state of death. Whether knowledge shall ever be possessed by those who are dead, depends on the fact whether God will ever raise them up from the dead. That fact is to be settled by revelation and not by conjecture. Your difficulty is very much like the Sadduces, who "err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God."

GEO.—"The truth is, the terms perish, destroy, and death, are used in a figurative sense when applied to the punishment of the wicked. Admit this, and let Scripture interpret Scripture, and all the consequences of the false rule we have just illustrated are avoided."

EXR.—We do not admit any such thing; and it is for you to prove it, if you can. We know such an admission would extricate you from your herculean task of proving man's natural immortality. You must not beg the question, but meet it with a "Thus saith the Lord, man is immortal—he cannot die; therefore when I say all the wicked will I *destroy*, I mean I will eternally *preserve* them in torment." Now, Br. George, your work is fairly before you. Will you do it? Give us *one* passage. Have you one? Where is it? *No where!*

GEO.—"We obtain light upon the intermediate state by what is said to Abraham, (Gen. 25 : 8,) "Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and was gathered to his people." This, by a superficial reader of the Bible, might be supposed to mean that Abraham's body was buried with his people. But it is not, for his fathers were buried hundreds of

miles from him; some in Chaldea; and Terah in Haren, in Mesopotamia, while Abraham was buried in the cave of Macphelar, in Canaan. The sense of the passage is this, that he was gathered to the assembly of the blest, that he went to those good men among his ancestors, who were united to that assembly."

Exr.—It is an easy matter to assume a point; so you assume that Abraham had a *ghost—a soul*, that he gave up to go to his "*good* fathers." The fact is, so far as Scripture gives us an account of his "*fathers*," they were all idolaters; and hence he was called to go out from his kindred and his father's house to another land; but it seems you place him back among them when dead: perhaps they had passed a *purgatory* and become "good *men*." Abraham was gathered unto his fathers, without distinction of moral character; and hence he must be in a state involving a common gathering: they were all in heaven or all in hell, if your theory is true; but if all were silent in death, then he could be gathered into the same state.

Let us look at this text and subject a little further. It was *Abraham* that gave up the ghost. Now if he gave up the ghost then, he—*Abraham*—had no ghost left. Abraham lost the possession of that which he gave up; so that, if the ghost was his soul, he lost his soul and was without one. The text saith nothing of Abraham's ghost or soul being gathered to his fathers: it was *Abraham* who was gathered: the same *person* who gave up the ghost, and not the ghost he gave up. Was the body Abraham, friend George? According to your theory it was the body that gave up the soul; and yet, strange to tell, it was the thing given up, and not he who gave it up, that was gathered to his fathers!

But, friend G., you have mangled the text, and put your words in the place of God's words. The text saith—"Abraham gave up the ghost, *and died*." *Abraham* was dead; not alive, as you assume. Besides, the term "*gova*"—translated ghost—Prof. Pick, in his Bible Student's Concordance, says, is, literally, "*wasted away*." Abraham was "in a good old age," saith the text, and he "wasted away, and died." How very plain and simple is truth. The term *osaph*—translated gathered—Prof. Pick gives the literal sense, "*to be brought in*." Abraham died, and was brought into the state of his people, which was a state of death, where "there is *no knowledge*."

The same thing is said of Ishmael, verse 17 of the same chapter, as is said of Abraham, viz: that "he gave up the ghost and died, and was gathered to his people." As nothing very good is recorded of Ishmael, and he did "mock" the child of promise, it is for you to show that he was a "good man." But whatever his character, he was gathered to the same "people" as Abraham, for all you can prove to the contrary. Whatever the state of "the people" was, it was a state of *death, not life.*

J. Panton Ham.—It gives us much pleasure to lay the following letter from Br. Ham before our readers; both because of the excellent spirit it breathes and because it will serve to give fresh interest to the articles we have been republishing from his *Christian Examiner* on "The Cross of Christ." Those articles have appeared under a disadvantage by being in fragments, extending through so many months; yet we know they have been looked for by some of our readers with much interest, while others have been dissatisfied with our inserting them at all. Br. Grew felt that he could not wait till the articles were concluded before interposing some strictures on them; and we were of opinion that if Br. Ham was right, Br. Grew's remarks would serve to make our readers suitably cautious in adopting those views. Caution is important in any theological change. Some men seem ready to adopt any new view if it seems at all plausible; but we think great care is necessary in departing from those landmarks which have generally passed for truth; yet the mind should be open to investigate and weigh any *scriptural* argument, which may be urged in a candid manner, against any received opinions, whatever claims they may have to orthodoxy. Years ago we became satisfied that the common notion of *substitutionary* sufferings, or the idea that Christ died *instead* of us, or as a "*vicarious*" offering, in the sense of *paying our debts*, was without Scripture authority, robbing God of the privilege of *forgiving* our sins, and carried to its legitimate result compelled the belief of universal salvation to the honor of Christ, but to the dishonor of God. To talk of God's forgiving sins for which his justice demanded and *received satisfaction*, whether from the sinner or a *subititute*, is, to us, to talk a palpable contradiction. If the debt is paid the claim is liquidated, and it is mockery in the claimant, after that, to pretend to forgive the debt; he did not forgive it; he had his claim fully met. If Christ met the claim of divine justice against sinners, he met it for *all*, for he "tasted death for *every* man"—he "*died for all*," is the plain testimony of Scripture; and if as a *substitute*, then *all* are clear, and God's claim is satisfied; all sinners are free. Such a notion of the death of Christ the Scriptures do not

justify; for God "*forgiveth* iniquity, transgressions and sins." He is a sin *forgiving* God: and Jesus taught us to pray "forgive us our sins."

While we do not endorse every expression in the articles of Br. Ham, and perhaps may not agree with him in all his conclusions, we do dissent from the common notion of substitutionary sufferings, or Christ's suffering in "*our room and stead*," in the sense of "*paying* our debts." He "died for our sins," is a glorious truth, but not in the theological sense of a *substitute*. We are glad that Br. Grew is evidently modifying his views on the subject; for he now says, that Christ's death "was *vicarious* in *some sense*." That is true, but not in the sense usually maintained by scholastic theology. But we must not longer keep our readers from Br, Ham's letter. We intended only a single remark when we began, but have been led to protract them.

—

CLIFTON, BRISTOL, ENGLAND, March 2, 1854.

Dear Mr. Storrs:—Lest I shall appear discourteous in neglecting to notice the strictures of your excellent correspondent, Mr. Grew, on my papers on the "Doctrine of the Cross," which you have done me the honor to republish in your EXAMINER, will you allow me a very brief space, rather for the purpose of acknowledging Mr. Grew's "Review" than of entering upon a formal rejoinder. The temper of mind in which my Reviewer addresses himself to the duty of canvassing my statements is so truly exemplary that I am moved by a sense of gratitude to pay him this public tribute of thanks for the admirable combination of literary independence and theological ingenuousness which his "Review" exhibits. So rarely do we meet with the union of manly candor and Christian courtesy in the arena of religious polemics, that its occasional exhibition takes us with gratéful surprise. We are almost induced, under such pleasing circumstances, to forget the obligations of argumentation in the natural desire to open another sort of artillery—that of the heart's generosity, on our theological opponent. But I must forbear these amenities, though I think I should merit absolution were I even to attempt to occupy a whole number of your goodly EXAMINER in pourtraying the rich luxury of a generous religious controversy. Speaking the truth in love makes the truth itself sweeter, and even irradiates it with more than its native loveliness. Our mutual friend, Mr. Grew, has set us all an example worthy our study and imitation

If any controvertist has a claim upon our time and labor it is such an one as Mr. Grew, and I am anxious to take the earliest opportunity of assuring him that if I decline, as I am compelled by my many engagements to decline, to carry on a controversy in the the pages of the BIBLE EXAMINER, it is not because I disregard the arguments which he has advanced, for I have given them a careful consideration, and with all the impartiality that I am able to command. I must, however, take this opportunity of saying that I seemed to have failed to make plain to my friend, Mr. Grew, the drift of my meaning, which was not, by any means, as he supposes, to dispute the indisputable truth, "that the Ruler of the universe causes 'the wrath of man to praise him,'" for I conceive the death of our blessed Lord on the Cross to be an illustration of this truth, and when the whole series of papers shall have appeared in the EXAMINER, it will be seen that I so represent it. Let not my friend Mr. Grew suppose that I deny there was any "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" in the circumstance of Christ's death; nor imagine that I overlook the spontaneity of our Lord's sacrifice. The papers *yet to appear* will not only discover a proper recognition of these points in the inquiry, but also supply what appear to me to be the true expositions of those texts which he cites as apparently adverse to my theory of the Cross. I beg respectfully to remind him that throughout I am contending against that view of the Cross of Christ which makes it an awful judicial scene—which represents God in the attitude of the Penal Executioner of his violated laws, and Christ the vicarious victim of his judicial wrath. It is in the view of this representation that I say that the death of Christ was not designed "for any purpose connected with God's righteous government," &c. It is maintained that a *penal satisfaction* was demanded by God, and that without such a satisfaction the principles of his righteous government would have been treated with defiance, and his righteous authority set at naught. This view I am bound to deny, as being altogether contrary to the teaching of the Scripture, and it is against this theory that I contend. So far from saying that the death of Christ does *not* answer "any purpose connected with God's righteous government," I proceed to show in subsequent papers that it is just *the* grand moral agency of Christianity, and that which pre-eminently constitutes Christ both "the *wisdom* and the *power* of God." There are yet *five* more papers to appear on this subject. Will Mr. Grew oblige me by withholding his judgment until the whole series of papers is before him? He will see as he reads on that I have anticipated not a few of

his objections. I ask this favor partly because I do not think that he is in a fair position to judge of my theory until it is fairly and fully laid before him; and partly because I have already experienced in this country not a little demurring to my positions while in progress of publication, but which has been exchanged in the end for a decided approval. I may indeed fail after all to convince my friend that my theory is the true Scriptural theory, nevertheless I shall then have the satisfaction of knowing that he is acquainted with it, and shall have more cause to carefully weigh the considerations which he may do me the honor to advance against it. I feel persuaded that when he has perused all I have written, even though he should dissent from my conclusions, he will willingly withdraw the remark contained in your No. 4, of the current year, viz.: "How our respected author can maintain his views consistently with his avowed determination 'to appeal first and last to the law and the testimony for the rule of our faith,' I cannot possibly conceive,"—a remark which would only be justifiable on the proven fact that I had ignored the sacred testimony—which I humbly submit is *exclusively appealed to*, and, as my friend will see in the progress of the inquiry, in no partial and scanty measure.

I rejoice, my dear Mr. Storrs, that you have had the courage and energy to make the BIBLE EXAMINER a *semi-monthly*. I shall still more rejoice if the cordial co-operation of your friends will enable you before long to issue it *weekly*. Let your American friends know that their zeal is provoking very many on this side of the Atlantic, and bid them in the name of the British brethren "Go forward" in the great enterprize of scattering broad-cast the seed of the Kingdom. Wishing you personally every prosperity, and the blessing of our common Lord.

Believe me to be—

Your affectionate brother in Christ,

J. PANTON HAM.

"THE SPIRITUAL LIFE; A Sermon preached at the funeral of Frances Elizabeth Stowe, of Hampton, N. Y., a Student of the Troy Conference Academy, who died Oct. 12, 1853. By Rev. Jason F. Walker, A.M., Principal of the Academy."

We have received a copy of this Sermon, and have traveled through it in search of instruction. We are glad to find the author believes that spirits have "material forms." Yet he uses language that is liable to be construed into a denial of the resurrection. On page 8 he says:—

The properties of flesh and blood, corruption, dishonor and weakness, are expressly declared to be laid down in the grave not to be resumed—while the body that is to be the spiritual body (and it is to be specially observed that it is a *body*) enters upon its eternal inheritance in incorruption, glory and power.

But, say you, I must then change my ideas of spirit entirely, if I must suppose it possibly associated with a material form. That may be—for that no one is more responsible than yourself, unless you can show good authority for ever *evacuating* the word spirit of all connection with matter. And almost any authority will seem questionable if Christ has gone to heaven with the body Thomas *felt*, if the descriptions of the revelator are truthful, and if "there is a spiritual *body*."

Here the author insists on materiality strongly; but seems to deny the resurrection. Not *a* resurrection, absolutely, but the spirit does not *evacuate* all connection with matter when flesh ond blood is "laid down in the grave not to be resumed."

The author deals largely in poetry, but lacks in Scripture; though he says many excellent things. In the conclusion of his sermon, however, instead of following the apostolical injunction to "comfort one another with" the words of Christ's return from heaven and the resurrection of "the dead in Christ,"—see 1 Thess. 4 : 16–18—he breaks out in this language:—

If we could feel once and forever *sure* that "the loved and lost" we bear to the tomb, have already entered upon a conscious state of existence as real as ours, and sustaining that intimate relation to ours which I have endeavored to set forth in this discourse, should we not be comforted at this moment? Would not light shine in and upon our affliction, where now is a cloud of thick shadow?

He adds:—

True, the blow has fallen suddenly upon us. Oh how suddenly, and how heavy an one it is—Elizabeth Stowe is dead! I cannot realize it—I have written it down and looked at it, to make myself feel it. But in vain; my own hand writing gazed on me with the blank stare of an idiot. I have sounded it that I might make myself feel it. But my voice was in my ears like the hollow clatter of sounding brass. I *cannot* feel it—I must say it once more to my soul—Elizabeth is dead!

We do not wonder he could "not feel it:" because if his theory is true, Elizabeth Stowe was no more dead than he was; and his "own hand writing might well gaze on" him "with the blank stare of an idiot," when he had written that Elizabeth had entered on a "conscious state of existence as real as ours," and at the same time affirm she "is dead!" Surely such language may well be called "the hollow clattering of sounding brass."

To the "mourners," he next says:—

This havoc Death has wrought is *not* a great one. 'Tis little the icy hand can do. True he palsies the outward frame—shakes down the tenement of clay, but he has no power upon the glorious pillars of that "house not made with hands." In *that*, Elizabeth dwells—she is safe.

She has but passed through a necessary phenomenon—a legitimate operation of that law of the spiritual kingdom which forbids its inheritance to flesh and blood. Rejoice for *her* then that she has exchanged this corruptible for incorruptible—that she is clothed upon from on high.

Thus Elizabeth is not dead! So far from it, she has outstript Paul, who said, "At the *last* trump" we shall exchange "this corruptible for incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality."—1 Cor. 15. But the author of the sermon has refused to let Elizabeth stop for Paul's last trump to sound, and has complacently made death to do the good office. He concludes his sermon with this announcement :—

And now we are going to carry the daughter, the sister, the school-mate to her resting place.

He had just told them she now "dwells in that house not made with hands." But now they "are going to carry" her to "her resting place"! Surely error needs a wide covering to hide it from the gaze of a thinking mind. Such theology as is developed in this discourse might pass once, but its days are well nigh numbered. The resurrection from the dead is the gospel hope; and with that, Christ and his disciples have taught us to "comfort one another;" and not with fancy sketches of *dead-and-alive* states. Christ is "the resurrection and the life." "This is the will of him that sent me, that * * * he that believeth on the Son may have everlasting life; and I will *raise him up at the* LAST DAY," not when he dies.—John 6 : 40.

THE CONFLICT.

In this city we are glad that PROF. MATTISON—minister of the Methodist E. Church, in John Street—has thought our views of sufficient importance to give a series of discourses against them. Discussion excites inquiry; and truth has nothing to fear in the conflict. We respect the Prof., and intend to treat him kindly and courteously; but shall review his discourses, as reported to us, and he shall have opportunity to correct the report if he finds any misrepresentation of his remarks, and also to reply to us through the EXAMINER if he chooses.

His text, for the first discourse, was, Job 14 : 10—"Man dieth and wasteth away; yea man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?"

His first remark was—"The doctrine of the immortality of the soul of man has never been disputed, from the days of our Saviour, until within the last ten years. It was first assailed in this country about ten years ago by a man who had been eminently useful to our own denomination; and one, too, of no common intellect, (more natural, however, than cultivated:) I allude to Mr. Storrs."

As to our "intellect," we leave others to judge; but the compliment of being the "first" to assail the common notion of the immortality of the soul we must decline receiving; because, though well intended by friend Mattison, it is a mistake. The doctrine has been called in question by eminent men years ago; and men of no less eminence than Martin Luther, John Locke Esq., and Milton, in his prose writings on theology; especially in the chapter on the state of the dead. Locke's views on the subject may be seen in his work "Reasonableness of Christianity." Luther said in his "Defence—Proposition 27th," published 1520—more than three hundred years ago—"I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and and his faithful, such as that he is Emperor of the world, King of heaven, and God upon the earth—that the *soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals."

It were easy to name others who have disputed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul before "Mr. Storrs" ever had his mind called to the subject; but these names are sufficient to show that Prof. Mattison was mistaken at the outset. Again he says :—

"Mr. Storrs sympathized with Mr. Miller in his premillenium views of the reign of Christ; and the doctrine of the non-immortality, and annihilation of the wicked, grew out of that, somewhat, perhaps, in the following manner :—If Christ comes in 1843 he will find a great many wicked living; and what is to become of them? So it was decided, they must be annihilated."

Here again our friend Mattison is entirely mistoken. Mr. Storrs had never seen Mr. Miller, nor any Preacher that sympathized with him at the time he preached what are called his "*Six Sermons*" on the "*Inquiry, are the Wicked Immortal?*" and it is due to Mr. Miller to say, that he never embraced Mr. Storrs' views on the immortality question, and always opposed them; nor has Mr. Storrs met with less opposition from the ministers who first set out with Mr. Miller. The Six Sermons were preached and published in Albany early in the spring of 1842, and "Millerism"—as it was called—had no connection with them, nor over Mr. Storrs at that time; so that friend Mattison errs as to the origin of the doctrine. Prof. Mattison says :—

"Not one of the advocates of this doctrine knows anything about Greek or Hebrew. We do not speak at random when we assert, that not one of the advocates of this theory can translate one passag of Greek or Hebrew if it would save his neck from the halter."

Whether our friend has spoken at "random" or not we cannot tell, for we do not know how much "previous calculation" he might have had before he spoke. We none of us care to boast much of our knowledge: but we should rather think there is at least "one" that might be found among us that had some knowledge of Hebrew and Greek; if not in this country, possibly we might find one in England or Scotland. If there is none there, Br. Ham ought to be taken care of by the British authorities, because he has advertised to instruct young gentlemen and ladies in the Greek language.

But suppose we could not "translate," if we have the help of Lexicons, with Greek and Hebrew Concordances, we must be stupid indeed if "not one of" us "knows anything about Greek or Hebrew"! That is almost equal to saying, that the Greek and Hebrew Lexicons, with the various Concordances, such as Prof. Pick's, are all worthless, and the authors of them imposters, who deserve to have their "necks" in "the halter" for so imposing upon us. We are quite content to let our learning or our ignorance speak for itself, and ask our opponents to manifest their learning in their warfare against our views; but let it be Biblical knowledge. Once more the Professor says:—

"It has been triumphantly asserted that 'the Bible nowhere affirms that man has an immortal soul..' But the Bible throughout assumes this great truth. The Bible does not say in a didactic form, There is a God. Without stoping to prove it, it assumes this also."

We "triumphantly" call upon our opponents to give us one text that as plainly declares the immortality of the soul as the following do the being of "a God." "Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God is one LORD."—Deut. 6 : 4. "There is * * * one God and Father of all, and through all, and in you all."—Eph. 4 : 4–6. Again—"There is none other God but one * * * to us there is but one God, the Father."—1 Corth. 8 : 4–6.

Has not this testimony the "didactic form," Br. Mattison? When you will give us one text from the Bible that saith, "Hear, O man, thy soul is an immortal soul," then we will excuse you for placing the evidence of the existence of God on a level with the evidence of an immortal soul in man. The Bible demonstrates the existence of God in explicit language, and by the works he performs. But no explicit testimony is in the Bible in favor of the immortality of man's soul, and there is not one "assumption" of its immortality in that book; *no, not one.* God never calls men to believe assumptions, but testimony. Saith Jesus, "If I had not done among them the works which none other did, they had not had sin;" plainly showing that God does not expect men to believe *assumptions.* Give us one "Thus saith the Lord," Br. Mattison; it will weigh more than an hour's harangue about assumptions. The Prof. proceeds to say:—

"The Bible throughout recognizes the distinction between matter and spirit. But according to the modern Sadduceeism, man has no spirit. His body is his spirit; and his spirit is his body."

This declaration is rather disingenuous, friend M. Man has a spirit: this we have never denied. But the question is—Is that spirit a distinct entity, or being, and is it immortal? You say, *yes;* and we say, *no.* Now give us one text that affirms your side of the question. Not one can be found in the Bible. The Prof. says:—

"It was not enough for Job to say, in our text, 'man dieth and wasteth away.' This would have been enough had man been only dust; but he adds, 'Yea, man giveth up the ghost'—that is, his spirit, 'and where is he?'"

Now friend Mattison, as we are "not learned," and you are presumed to be, how could you, without note or comment, say, *ghost* is "*spirit.*" Now if you are learned you knew the original word for *spirit,* in Hebrew, is *ruah;* and that the word here translated *ghost,* is not *ruah,* but *gova;* which Prof. Pick says is, literally, *wasted away.* Where is your authority for saying it means man's "spirit"? We think you have none; but it may be it is our lack of knowing the Hebrew that makes us think so. Will you please lend us your critical knowledge in the matter? But our Professor proceeds thus:—

"'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground,' that is, his *frame.* According to the theories of these men, this was all that was necessary to make Adam a living, conscious being. Was he such? No. Why not? It was a perfect organization; bones, muscles, nerves, and brain."

We are sorry to say, that the Prof. entirely misunderstands us, as well as Moses. Moses does not say the Lord formed man's "frame" out of the dust—but "formed *man:*" it was the creature man, and not a mere "frame." Nor was this perfect organism "all that was necessary to make Adam a living, conscious being." No: we never taught nor believed any such thing. But what was necessary to that end? Our opponents say, it was to create another entity and put it into the man formed of dust; but the record says, "the breath of life," infused into man's nostrils, was what made him "a *living* soul." He was before a soul without life, but is now one with life. There is no record of any other creation pertaining to man, and it is a pure assumption to affirm there was any other. The Professor continues:—

"The eye was there, but it had never seen yet. The telescope was mounted, but the Astronomer had not yet taken his place."

Indeed! Then, if this illustration is just, the eye not only had not seen "yet," but it never did and never can see. Surely the Telescope does *not see*, but he who looks through it. It seems the "astronomer"—otherwise, the fancied immortal soul—must be a poor blind thing, for we have no account that it ever did see, or ever could, till it had a telescope made for it: and if it should lose its instrument it would be as blind as ever, for all the illustration of the Prof. teaches. He goes on to say:

"The ear was there, but it had never heard yet; the heart, but it had not beat yet; the lungs, but they had never heaved yet. If the doctrine we are opposing be true, all that was necessary now, was to shake the machine and it would immediately commence its functions.',

Yes, brother Mattison; and what more did God, the Maker of man, do than to shake the machine, by the action of the breath of life? The goldsmith makes a watch, perfect in all its parts, and pronounces it a watch: but it does not tick yet: the hands are there, but they do not move; the hair spring is there, but it does not stir; the main spring is in, but it exerts no power; every wheel is in its place, but no motion is seen. If it is a perfect watch "all that was necessary now was to shake the machine, and it would immediately commence its functions"! Certainly it does not take one who can "translate Greek and Hebrew" to see that a wise man would "wind up" the watch, and all would be in motion; and no need of putting a spiritual watch into it to keep it in motion.

Man was a perfect organism for the purpose God designed him at his formation. He was *man;* not *half* a man, and the poorest part too; but the record declares that *man* was formed of the dust. When the organism was perfected its Maker set it in motion by the action of the breath of life; and there is no evidence of the addition of another entity, called a soul, either mortal or immortal; yet Prof. M. says—

"Now he received his living, conscious, and immaterial spirit."

This is a purely gratuitous assumption; without even the semblance of one Scripture authority. We meet it, therefore, with a simple challenge for the proof. Further the Prof. says:—

"Before he [man] was only matter. By matter, we mean, that which has form, weight, color, can be seen, felt, weighed, measured, is fusible, &c. The soul of man has none of these properties."

A pretty fair description of a *theological* soul. But it is an effectual cure for "Ghost stories." For the fancied ghosts *can be seen*, therefore they are matter; the Professor being judge; so they are not "disembodied souls." The description also settles the case of the Rich man and Lazarus, that they were not theological souls; for the rich man man *saw* Lazarus; and we rather think Lazarus had a "form," or he could not have been seen; so Lazarus was not a spirit, for the Prof. says "form" is not a "property of spirit"—it has *no form*. We think he has given a pretty fair description of the theological soul—it is *nothing*—has no existence.—*More anon.*

From A. N. Seymour, and Wife.

ADDISON, Michigan.

Br. Storrs—Success has attended our labors this winter past, and many stand ready to acknowledge the truths we have set before them. In almost all our discourses we have made the Life theme quite prominent. We have never labored *harder* and accomplished *more* since we cherished the glorious hope than we have the past winter. Opposition has raged briskly, but it has been compelled to give way before the truth. Our congregations have been first rate, as for numbers, all the time. We have scattered the *seed* bountifully, and we hope to reap an abundant harvest, after some serious reflection and investigation.

We have been breaking up new ground in ten different places during the winter: and this has been our labor almost all of the time since we came west nearly eight years ago. In consequence of our arduous labors for some four months past, we are quite worn down and out of health; Mrs. Seymour especially. Ten years have passed since we commenced proclaiming the coming kingdom. And from that time to this our time has been spent in laboring for the good of others. It has been a constant tax on our lives, and sacrifices all the while, consequently we are poor, and without a home in this world, only as we find a lodging place in the dwelling of some kind brother or brethren here and there. We feel that we have gone about the length of our chain. A firm belief in the coming of Christ soon, has nerved us to do more than we were in reality able to do. Yet we do not feel to regret or complain, but only to desire ardently the coming of our dear Saviour, to give us a resting place in the coming kingdom.

From Z. Campbell.

SOUTH ADAMS, Mass., March 21, 1854.

Br. Storrs:—A short time since I held two discussions on the Life theme, in Northfield, Conn.; one of which was in part with the Congregational Minister of that place. It was a rare thing there. The result is favorable to truth; and the people in that place have called me back to preach on the subject.

I lamented very much hearing of your loss by fire.

Yours, as ever, striving for the kingdom.

Extracts from Letters of Contributors to our Aid.

RUFUS WENDELL *says* :—

Br. Storrs:—Wishing to be one of the sharers of your recent loss by fire, and being desirous also of expressing in a *practical* way my grateful appreciation of your interesting labors as Publisher and Editor of the EXAMINER, I take great pleasure in enclosing herewith a donation. God bless you, brother, in the blessed work to which you are devoting the whole energy of your mind and body.

MRS. A. J. HASKELL *writes* :—

Br. Storrs:—Your paper has just come to hand, and the cause of its delay is therein mentioned. I feel to sympathise with you in your loss, and feel it a duty and privilege to give in my mite, with other members of the "household of faith." I consider the EXAMINER an excellent paper, and one that has done, and is still doing, a great deal of good. Your "Six Sermons, are the Wicked Immortal?" were the means of opening my eyes, to see there was no life out of Christ, for which I feel indebted to you. May the Lord bless you in your labors, and open the hearts of his people, to assist you in your present troubles, is my sincere wish.

"M. H. P." *writes* :—

Br. Storrs:—Hearing of your severe loss by fire, and feeling much interested in the spread of the glorious Truth of Immortality and Eternal Life through Jesus Christ, I feel it to be my duty to do what I can to assist you in continuing in your good work. I send you Fifty Dollars, and may the Lord help the brethren who are interested in this glorious cause, to give as the Lord has prospered them. I believe the Lord will soon be here, and what we do must be done quickly.

LUTHER HALE *writes* :—

Br. Storrs:—I see by the last EXAMINER, that you have met with a heavy loss by fire, and I feel to sympathise with you very much. I enclose a small mite to assist, and help you on with your valuable paper. I would be glad to do much more, but I am not blessed with means to do but little.

J. W. DYE *says* :—

Br. Storrs:—I feel to sympathise with you in your loss by fire, and do what little I can towards helping you. I hope all the readers of the EXAMINER will feel it a privilege to do what they are able in this matter.

D. COGSWELL *writes* :—

Br. Storrs:—I appreciate your labors of love to a world lying in darkness in regard to the glorious doctrine of Life only through Christ. The Church and world are asleep in regard to the awful judgments that are coming on the earth. What is the cause that has produced this aspect? It is preaching the doctrine of Rewards and Punishments at death: and not preaching, as the word of God does, the coming of Christ to reward every man according as his works shall be. O, immortal-soulism, what hast thou done? Brother, go on in your labor of love to man. May the Lord help you, and give you strength to sound the gospel of the kingdom. Brethren, Br. Storrs has met with a loss. Let us all help him as God has prospered us. Enclosed I send you a donation, to help you on in your labors, as a free will offering. Yours, in hope of immortality at the coming of Christ.

E. R. PINNEY *writes* :—

I enclose one dollar for the fire. You will excuse me for laying hold of, this once, the best end of the last sentence of Acts 20 : 35. The amount feebly expresses my desires, but fear not. Let your motto be, "Jehovah Jireh."

LESTER F. SIKES *writes* :—

The EXAMINER has come to hand this evening, stating the delay which involves you in a loss. It also states, of those that have been informed of the occurrence, that a Free will offering had been advanced to you for the cause of Truth. May all the subscribers of the paper, and lovers of the cause, feel called upon to do likewise, as they have ability. Feeling that you should not sustain the loss, but come up, at the lowest statement, two-fold in advance of means before the loss, that you may have no extra anxiety of mind for the means to go forward in the cause of Truth. Please accept the enclosed as my portion. I hope all that can, will, without delay, act promptly, that Love may be seen in Works to your relief and the advancement of the cause with double energy.

PARKER SAWYER *writes* :—

Br. Storrs:—The EXAMINER for March 15, has just reached me, by which I regret to learn you are called upon to sustain quite a loss by fire. It, however, may not be materially felt if borne equally by the friends of the cause. I hasten to forward the enclosed, and if more is needed, it shall be forthcoming. The regular and continued publication of the EXAMINER must not be embarrassed—the cause of Christ and humanity forbid it. This misfortune may serve as a trial of faith and *sincerity* of its professed friends; but I am sure the obligation it throws upon them will be promptly met by their contributing to your abundant relief.

—

RECEIPTS to aid the Editor since our last issue. The receipts have all been accompanied with such words of kindness and sympathy as have been truly refreshing, and caused our heart to be lifted up to God with thanksgiving, and for a blessing upon the heads of the donors. Dear friends, if "It is more blessed to give than to receive," *you* must be blessed indeed; for, our heart has been kept constantly melted by these tokons of Christian affection and sympathy. May you all be enriched more and more with that heavenly grace which shall ripen you for the kingdom of God.

Received of Freeman Gladding, $1. John Kemp, $5. Wm. Mayell, $4. L. F. Sikes, $1. Rufus Wendell, $2. Mrs. J. A. Haskell, $1. M. H. P., $50. E. R. Pinney, $1. Luther Hale, $1. F. S. Axe, $4.50. J. W. Dye, $1.50. D. Cogswell, $2. Parker Sawyer, $2.

THE *friends* who have so generously contributed to our aid can each of them have a copy of the EXAMINER sent to any person they may designate, for the present year; or, a copy, *in sheets*, of any previous year, from '49 to '53, *without charge*, except that of *postage*.

THE LATE FIRE.—We have the satisfaction of announcing that the Stereotype Plates of "*Bible* vs. *Tradition*" are saved from the wreck; but we are sorry to add, that the Plates of the two works of Ham are destroyed, together with $50 worth of Tract plates, besides the plates of the Six Sermons Quarto, or Bible Examiner *Extra*. Our whole loss, including $80 worth of paper, amounts to about $400. The plates for Ham's works cost between $150 and $175. We deeply regret this loss; and especially as we are almost entirely out of those works.

—

THE "SIX SERMONS."—We have still left the stereotype plates of these Sermons in the 18mo., or pamphlet form: they being in Philadelphia, escaped the fire. They were stereotyped about one year after the Quarto, and hence will be found somewhat emended in a few places and expressions. We have had it in contemplation for some time past to revise and enlarge these sermons, with a view to publish them in a more readable form; and also to add, in an appendix, other sermons, which we have preached at different times, on kindred topics, making a volume probably larger than "Bible *vs.* Tradition," and with larger type. If this is done, the whole will be preceded with a brief Memoir of the Author, and a history of the Six Sermons. The whole work is in a process of preparation, but whether ever issued will depend upon circumstances, and the possession of funds to do it. Should it be called for, and funds be obtained, it will be issued in a few months.

—

TRACTS.—We shall issue a new series of Tracts just as soon as we are prepared with matter, and have funds. "*An Appeal to Men of Reason and Common Sense*," found in this number of the EXAMINER, is put up in a Tract of four large 12mo. pages, large type, and can be had at 75 cents per hundred copies. It was written by a brother formerly a Methodist Preacher, but now standing firm on the rock—"No immortality or endless life except through Christ alone." This Tract is his first effort, and we hope he may follow it with others equally good.

STORRS' MISCELLANY.—We have not above 75 copies of this work left; and as we do not design to get up another edition, we have none to sell, hereafter, except at the *retail* price, *viz.*: 50 cents.

—

AT WORK.—We clip the following notice from the *Cincinnati Atlas*, for Saturday March 25th. Br. Hudson, it seems, has commenced his public labors in that city, and we rejoice that he has done so. May the Lord sustain him.

Religious Notice.—Athanasius, the Father of Orthodoxy, was most fond of proving the divinity of Christ by his power to give life to the dead and restore lost immortality to man. The doctrine of Christ as the Life Giver will be presented by Mr. C. F. Hudson, at the small Lecture Room of the Mechanic's Institute in this city, to-morrow. Services at 11 o'clock, A. M., and 3 1-2 P. M. Subjects: The distinction between Justice and Goodness, and The End of Evil. Skeptics, whether orthodox or heterodox, are especially invited to attend.

—

"THE WEEKLY FOREST ROSE" edited by Ross Alley, is published at Versailles, Ind., at one dollar per year. Its motto is, "*Belonging to no Party—Independent on all Subjects.*" It is hereafter to be published under the name of "*Literary Messenger.*" It has opened its columns to the discussion of the immortality question, and several articles have appeared in it pro and con.

We thank the Editor for his kind notice of the "BIBLE EXAMINER." We wish friend Alley success in his enterprize.

AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.—*The Second Advent Watchman*, edited by Br. Joseph Turner, Hartford, Conn.; and *The Advent Harbinger*, edited by Br. Joseph Marsh, Rochester, N. Y., have both kindly noticed our loss by fire; for which they have our thanks. Those papers are *weekly* quartos, of eight pages, at $2 per year. The Editors both differ, on some topics, from each other, and from us: but *we are all agreed* that "Eternal Life and Immortality are only through Christ," and that, the End of the wicked is *utter extermination*—a cessation from conscious existence: or, in other words—"The wicked shall *die*"—not live in endless sin and suffering, as taught by Theologians.

SEVERAL ARTICLES intended for this number of the EXAMINER are necessarily *deferred*. We will try to occupy less space ourself next time, that others may have more.

—

THE EXAMINER for '49 to '53 can still be furnished *in sheets*, at fifty cents per year. Bound, two years in a volume, can be had of us for '50 and '51, also '52 and '53. Price $1.50 per volume.

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY, NO

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED SE

At No. 130 F

TERMS---One Doll

Always in

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR

"GREAT PROJECT

Such is the topic on whic
land speaks in one of a seri
in that country. His spec
esting, though not altoget
There are some points in
facts already existing or h
be realized. These facts
ever that the Napoleon
Colored Beast, Rev. 17.
give some extracts from th

The Deep and Deadly
throne of France, is still
penetrable being that he w
to be watched and guarde
than before. With consu
simulation, no sooner had
than he proclaimed "Peac
former apathy and quiesce
hibited that serpent-like ch
ed to him after the revolut
himself for a sudden spring,
within his folds, to prepare
violent attack.

Ever since December, 18
to point out, in these page
der which most men labore
of Louis Napoleon. Whil
nounced him little better t
ed a conviction of his capa
tion, especially to one featu
always a proof of some f
quality—the gradual devel
A man who gradually deve
to the circumstances of the
greater or less degree, po
This quality we discover
Louis Napoleon ever sinc
admitted that his subsequen
justified what was said. H
has been more rapid and
reason to expect; and, the
tled to ask for some atten
marks.

Immediately after the fa
cember, 1851, the English
lent attack upon the prese

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, APRIL 15, 1854. NO. 8.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"GREAT PROJECTS OF FRANCE."

Such is the topic on which a tract writer in England speaks in one of a series of tracts being issued in that country. His speculations are quite interesting, though not altogether reliable, we think. There are some points in it, however, which are facts already existing or highly probable soon to be realized. These facts convince us more than ever that the Napoleon Dynasty is the Scarlet Colored Beast, Rev. 17. We have concluded to give some extracts from the tract.—ED. EX.

The Deep and Deadly man who occupies the throne of France, is still the same silent and impenetrable being that he was at first, and requires to be watched and guarded against more carefully than before. With consummate wisdom and dissimulation, no sooner had he secured the empire, than he proclaimed "Peace," and subsided into his former apathy and quiescence. So far he has exhibited that serpent-like character which we ascribed to him after the revolution of 1851:—unfolding himself for a sudden spring, and then recoiling back within his folds, to prepare for a future and equally violent attack.

Ever since December, 1849, we have endeavored to point out, in these pages, the misconception under which most men labored as to the real character of Louis Napoleon. While almost every one pronounced him little better than an idiot, we expressed a conviction of his capacity, and directed attention, especially to one feature of his mind, which is always a proof of some formidable and powerful quality—the gradual development of his character. A man who gradually developes himself, according to the circumstances of the moment, is always, in a greater or less degree, powerful and formidable. This quality we discovered and pointed out in Louis Napoleon ever since 1849; and it must be admitted that his subsequent career has more than justified what was said. His progress ever since has been more rapid and vigorous than we had reason to expect; and, therefore, we may be entitled to ask for some attention to our present remarks.

Immediately after the famous *coup d'etat* of December, 1851, the English press commenced a violent attack upon the present Emperor of France. No language was too strong, no terms of vituperation were too gross, to be applied to him. Even those who condescended to accept an invitation to his table were assailed, by a writer in the *Times*, under the signature of "An Englishman," with a degree of ferocity which, being *anonymous*, was as cowardly as it was brutal. Having secured the throne, his majesty issued a manifesto of "universal peace," and subsided into apparent apathy and inertness. This unexpected moderation produced a change in popular opinion; and those who execrated him as king "Stork," were willing to hold him up to public admiration as king "Log." After awhile the ambition of the Emperor Nicholas began to awaken apprehensions of a mighty convulsion in the East; and knowing that we could not depend upon the treacherous professions of Austria, or the King of Prussia, we became sorely perplexed in looking about for an ally upon the Eastern question. The whole of Europe had been alienated from us (most justly) by the petty meddling of Lord Palmerston, who encouraged revolutionists everywhere to take up arms, and then, when they were defeated, left them to be shot or hanged, without attempting to interfere for them! This ignoble policy had turned all parties against us, both constitutionalists and revolutionists; while the consummate skill and deep-designing genius of Louis Napoleon had so dexterously contrived it, that the same individual who overturned the republics, both of France and Rome, was looked up to as their supreme patron by the revolutionists of Europe; while he was equally respected by constitutional soverigns, for having crushed down the spirit of revolution! How these two conflicting merits could meet together in one person—how the same man could be, at once, the patron of revolutionists and of despots, none can account for but the author of all evil, by whom the capacity was given. But it shows us the reed that we lean upon, when we attempt to oppose our British statesmen to the subtlety and genius of Louis Napoleon. Lord Palmerston, an incessant talker, who managed to injure and offend all parties on the continent, is a most unequal antagonist to Louis Napoleon; who, without opening his lips more than once a year, has contrived to make himself the friend of all, and the arbiter of the destinies of half the world.

It is with this deep and deadly man that we have been compelled to form an alliance, for the simple reason that our foreign secretary had disgusted *all*, without being of service to *any*; and now we must either take up arms against half the world, or hang our prosperity upon the caprice or fidelity of Napoleon. Should we break off our alliance with him, we have no ally left upon the face of the earth, nor upon the face of the water either. * *

Our public journals, after the greatest abuse and insult heaped upon Louis Napoleon, have lately discovered that he is one of the best of men!—our first ally and sincerest friend! From mean abuse they have descended to still meaner sycophancy. The "Standard" taking the lead, as usual, in every act of unworthiness. Because he has not made war upon Europe before this time—because he has acted with common sense for his own purposes—he is supposed to have changed his nature and to have become a model of virtue. The Ethiopian has enveloped himself in the white robes of innocence (borrowed for an hour), and we fancy that he himself has become white. Meantime, while the public press is defending itself by sycophancy, our unhappy statesmen are perplexed "in the extreme." They dare not announce their suspicions of Louis Napoleon, nor break off the alliance; yet they know, perfectly well, that his whole object, at this day, is nothing but self-aggrandizement. They know that he is making use of the British alliance and the British fleet to extend the power and dominions of France. He is making a weapon out of the simplicity of the British nation, with which he will cut his way to a second empire (in the East.) He has already played with the French nation, as if they were children. Statesmen, men of science, soldiers, and even great commanders, he has outreached and outwitted them all: thus he has gained one empire already. He has equally outwitted the subtle conclave of the Vatican; and under the name of protector, he has made himself the master both of Rome and the Pontiff—while he now and then amuses the world with the rumor of the withdrawal of his garrison from Rome. He is now preparing to overreach, in the same manner, both England and the Sultan, and to check-mate even Russia herself, with all her diplomatic astuteness. He has reduced politics to a game of "fool in the middle," on a grand scale—he has occupied the French corner of Europe in his own person—he has got one of his generals into the Roman corner—and his next move will be to get another general (with an army) into the corner of Constantinople; while England will be left, with outstretched hands and astonished eyes, as *Fool in the Middle*. Such is the game of the master politician of the age! * * * * *

We may be assured that the embarrassment of our situation is as well known to foreign powers as the amount of our national debt; and upon this knowledge they are acting. Russia has been encouraged by it to make her advances upon Turkey; and Louis Napoleon, we need not doubt, has weighed it in his mind, and has shaped his schemes accordingly. His object in forming so strict an alliance with England, is nothing less than to convert our ships, men, and treasures, into the instruments of his ambition. Russia has seized the Principalities—the British and French fleets enter the Bosphorus. This is the first step in the skillful march of his ambition, yet nothing seems more natural and correct. The Turkish fleet has been destroyed at Sinope; it is quite natural that the allied fleets should advance from the Bosphorus to the Euxine. There is nothing suspicious in that second move! By and by Russia will threaten to cross the Danube, and to advance by land upon Constantinople. But an advance by land can only be prevented by a military force—a fleet can do nothing. We have not a regiment to spare—we have only a naval force at our command. Our kind and faithful ally has more troops than he can pay: he will offer to send about 70,000 men to Constantinople, merely to prevent its being occupied by the Russians. Nothing is more natural! If we can spare no land forces, our ally, France, must send a double amount, both for us and for herself. But we are acting in a joint alliance, and as we cannot spare *men*, we are bound, in honor, to contribute *money*. France will send a double amount of troops, which she can afford; and we shall contribute a double amount of money, which France cannot afford. Nothing can be more natural! With *our money*, and *his own* troops, Louis Napoleon will occupy a most agreeable position—he will occupy Constantinople with a force entirely devoted to himself, paid (one half) with English money; while the British fleet will continue in the Turkish waters, doing one half the work of keeping the Russian fleet in check, without being able to interfere, in the slightest degree, with the military occupation of Constantinople. Nothing can be more natural and reasonable than all this! One step follows directly from the other—one move necessitates the other. No one can find fault with Louis Napoleon, or accuse him of the slightest assumption; he is only discharging his duty as a faithful ally! But the result of his fidelity will be this:—That he will become master of Constantinople, with our concurrence, our assistance, and our money! and we shall find ourselves the passive instruments of another man's ambition—raising our bitterest enemy to uncontrollable power. * *

Observe with what consummate skill Louis Napoleon has managed with respect to Rome. He has got absolute possession of the capital of the Roman Church—he is master of the Pope, and conclave of Cardinals. The life and property of all are in his hands. He has conquered Rome herself as effectually as ever Rome conquered any province of the ancient world, and yet he has escaped all the dangers and responsibilities of conquest. No one can charge him with ambition; he was only assisting the Holy Father to regain his throne! Excellent son of the Church! Truly his most Christian majesty! No one can charge him with disturbing the balance of power, by getting military possession of the capital of Italy—he was putting down revolution, and setting up the Holy Catholic faith. Exemplary saint! Ah! if all who have had as much power had but used it with so much disinterestedness! But, for all that, he is absolute master of central Italy, and of the capital of Christendom; which even the most ambitious might consider a splendid acquisition. In the same innocent manner—with the same love of peace—with the same simple-hearted desire of doing good, he will take Constantinople and the Bosphorus under his special protection. And, so little ambitious is he of praise, he will allow the British fleet to cooperate in the good work, and to share the renown; but, having an army as well as a fleet, *he* will have all the substantial power. In short, he will become

master of the capital of Islam
important military position in
now master of the capital
yet will so carry out his sche
pear, all the time, to be doing
tion—an act of pure benevo
him the praises of the silly "
who are so unwise as to jud
tions, without looking to the
got possession of Constantino
one can find fault with him;
by conquest, but by permissio
self. He has not destroyed t
in Europe! not he! he is onl
sia from destroying it! But
hold in his hands the keys of
the strongest military positio
most important of all naval p
pitals of the Eastern and W
all this as a friend and ally—
nevolence and disinterested fi
shall destroy many; and wha
thank him for destroying then
knife to the throat of Europe
suavity of features—such ten
—such softness of speech, tha
the knife, the more will they
and extol his benevolence!
quered detraction both in Fr
he has buried all his real eno
of apparent public services, a
praised where, two years ag
execrated. We are sorry to
press has been guilty of this d
that of reviling him far more
deserved; and now, of praisi
it once reviled him. The s
ness will continue to the last
that he will make to univers
bewilder the public eye, that
demon for an instant, he will
tranformed into an angel of lig

Having got possession of
stantinople under the name
then be the easiest thing poss
mense projects into execution
then to extend the empire of
to restore the empire, but eve
thoughts of his great predeces
facts what the first Napoleon
dreams! It will be impossible
rel with or obstruct him, for
case, under the pacific title o
now master of Rome, yet no
to war with him, as he is only
Pope. He will be master o
der the same pacific disguise
his assistance, and now, too l
is but the vassal of his ally.
befall the Sultan, and every
vites his assistance. Havin
military position of Constanti
time to carry out the favorite
Napoleon—the object of his
first flush and glory of his g
Empire was Napoleon's first
gotten amidst all the succe

ube, and to advance by land upon
. But an advance by land can only
by a military force—a fleet can do
have not a regiment to spare—we
al force at our command. Our kind
y has more troops than he can pay :
send about 70,000 men to Constan-
to prevent its being occupied by
Nothing is more natural! If we
land forces, our ally, France, must
amount, both for us and for herself.
cting in a joint alliance, and as we
ien, we are bound, in honor, to con-
France will send a double amount
ch she can afford ; and we shall con-
le amount of money, which France
Nothing can be more natural!
ry, and *his own* troops, Louis Napo-
y a most agreeable position—he will
ntinople with a force entirely devo-
paid (one half) with English money ;
sh fleet will continue in the Turkish
one half the work of keeping the
n check, without being able to in-
slightest degree, with the military
Constantinople. Nothing can be
nd reasonable than all this! One
rectly from the other—one move ne-
ther. No one can find fault with
n, or accuse him of the slightest as-
is only discharging his duty as a
But the result of his fidelity will be
e will become master of Constanti-
ur concurrence, our assistance, and
id we shall find ourselves the passive
f another man's ambition—raising
nemy to uncontrollable power. * *
h what consummate skill Louis Na-
naged with respect to Rome. He
ite possession of the capital of the
h—he is master of the Pope, and
ardinals. The life and property of
ands. He has conquered Rome her-
lly as ever Rome conquered any pro-
ncient world, and yet he has escaped
rs and responsibilities of conquest.
charge him with ambition ; he was
the Holy Father to regain his throne!
of the Church! Truly his most
esty! No one can charge him with
balance of power, by getting milita-
of the capital of Italy—he was put-
olution, and setting up the Holy Ca-
Exemplary saint! Ah! if all who
uch power had but used it with so
restedness! But, for all that, he is
er of central Italy, and of the capital
m ; which even the most ambitious
r a splendid acquisition. In the same
ner—with the same love of peace—
e simple-hearted desire of doing good,
Constantinople and the Bosphorus un-
l protection. And, so little ambitious
e, he will allow the British fleet to co-
good work, and to share the renown ;
n army as well as a fleet, *he* will have
ntial power. In short, he will become

master of the capital of Islamism, and of the most important military position in the world—as he is now master of the capital of Christendom—and yet will so carry out his schemes, that he will appear, all the time, to be doing a most virtuous action—an act of pure benevolence, that will earn him the praises of the silly "Standard," and of all who are so unwise as to judge men by their actions, without looking to their motives. Having got possession of Constantinople as a protector, no one can find fault with him ; he has not gained it by conquest, but by permission of the Sultan himself. He has not destroyed the balance of power in Europe! not he! he is only trying to keep Russia from destroying it! But, for all that, he will hold in his hands the keys of Italy and the East—the strongest military positions in the world—the most important of all naval positions ; and the capitals of the Eastern and Western empires: and all this as a friend and ally—as a man of pure benevolence and disinterested fidelity! By peace he shall destroy many ; and what is more, they *will thank him for destroying them!* He will hold the knife to the throat of Europe and Asia with such suavity of features—such tenderness of expression—such softness of speech, that the nearer he brings the knife, the more will they cry out in his praise and extol his benevolence! He has already conquered detraction both in France and England—he has buried all his real enormities under an heap of apparent public services, and is now universally praised where, two years ago, he was universally execrated. We are sorry to say that the English press has been guilty of this double ignominy ; first, that of reviling him far more than he, at the time, deserved ; and now, of praising him still more than it once reviled him. The same course of weakness will continue to the last ; every fresh advance that he will make to universal empire, he will so bewilder the public eye, that after appearing as a demon for an instant, he will, a moment after, be tranformed into an angel of light. * * * * *

Having got possession of both Rome and Constantinople under the name of PROTECTOR, it will then be the easiest thing possible to carry his immense projects into execution—to restore first, and then to extend the empire of Napoleon. Not only to restore the empire, but even to realize the very *thoughts* of his great predecessor—to accomplish in facts what the first Napoleon only contemplated in dreams! It will be impossible for England to quarrel with or obstruct him, for he will act, in every case, under the pacific title of PROTECTOR. He is now master of Rome, yet no one dreams of going to war with him, as he is only the protector of the Pope. He will be master of Constantinople under the same pacific disguise. The Pope invited his assistance, and now, too late, discovers that he is but the vassal of his ally. The same fate will befall the Sultan, and every other power that invites his assistance. Having secured the grand military position of Constantinople, it will then be time to carry out the favorite project of the great Napoleon—the object of his earliest passion in the first flush and glory of his genius. The Eastern Empire was Napoleon's first love, never to be forgotten amidst all the successes of his maturity. And Napoleon the Third has long determined to execute his uncle's designs to the utmost letter. From Constantinople, therefore, he will steal his way along the classic shores of Asia Minor—by the Hellespont, of an hundred songs—by the tomb of Achilles—by the fields of Troy—by the birthplace of Homer—by the undying ruins of the Ionian coast—by old Damascus—by the deserted beach of Tyre and Sidon—by Acre, red with the bravest blood of a thousand years—beneath the sacred shadows of Lebanon and Carmel, until the little cloud, no larger than a hand, has spread over all the sky, and the heavens have become black with abundance of rain. In plain words, he will creep artfully along from Constantinople to Syria, and from Syria to the Holy Land—he will become *protector* of them all. Having kindly begun the protection of the Sultan, why should he draw back? why leave half the work unfinished? Benevolence grows through exercise! His benevolence will extend itself to every province of Asiatic Turkey (which he happens to wish for ;) and, in the exercise of this generous quality, he will become master of the East from the Bosphorous to the Arabian desert, and across, from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates. Once he has taken the first step, the rest will be a matter of course ; and all may be done quietly, and without bloodshed, for he will appear as a protector. Virtue has its reward even in this world. By means of this virtue and its reward, he will realize the wildest dreams of the great Napoleon ; and possess, in fact, what the other scarcely imagined in hope. And having extended his *protection* to the Euphrates, he will have entered upon the theatre of the FIRST prophetic empire—upon that of the golden head—the empire of Nebuchadnezzar. Such are, at this moment, his splendid schemes—the way is opening to their execution ; and never was so great a scheme committed to so masterly a hand. * * * *

But what we have now stated does not constitute the whole amount of Louis Napoleon's projects. He has fixed his eyes upon ITALY as well as the East ; and, having occupied the central position of Rome, he can spread his snares around, until he has made himself master of the entire peninsula. The revolutionists of Italy are devoted to his service and his name ; and the recollection of the imperial splendors of the first Napoleon will place upon his head (as on that of his predecessor) the iron crown of Lombardy. He will, inevitably, be king of Italy. Nor is even this all—he has extended his machinations to another peninsula.—SPAIN is slowly, but surely, falling into his hands. The shameless profligacy of the queen—the close connection which he has formed with the Spanish people, by the consummate policy of his marriage—the Spanish pride, gratified by that connection, all tend to the same point, to effect a revolution in the Spanish government, which will make him master of Spain, as well as of Italy. Every event of the day—every false step of others—the ambition of Nicholas—the imbecility of Pius the IX.—the frailty of Isabella—all the deeds and misdeeds of others, accumulate their force, and heap power and prosperity upon his head ; while he himself, silent and impenetrable, amuses the frivolous world by an

exaggeration of frivolity, yet watches every opportunity with the coolest judgment, and seizes every advantage with a grasp that nothing has ever shaken off. Believe us, that it is not Russia, nor the Pope, nor even France, that we are to fear—but it is the Emperor of France, and the NAME OF NAPOLEON, that overshadows the world—and will, hereafter, overwhelm the whole system of CHRISTENDOM!

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS AN EXAMPLE.—BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Continued from page 86.]

We may here introduce, as corroborative of our previous remarks, the following passage from the Epistle to the Colossians: "Whereof I Paul am made a minister; who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and *fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ* in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." The popular commentator, Albert Barnes, has so well expressed the meaning of this verse, that we cannot do better than quote his words, especially as he has the credit of being an "orthodox" writer. The somewhat obscure form of expression—"fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ," Mr. Barnes expounds thus: "That which I lack of coming up to the sufferings which Christ endured in the cause of the church." Here Mr. Barnes clearly perceives that Paul wished to be so conformed to the likeness of Christ, that he desired to have a common experience with him in every respect, even in his sufferings—as also he elsewhere expresses, "that I may know him, and *the fellowship of his sufferings*, being *made conformable to his death*."—Phil. 3 : 10. The apostle does not mean that there was any imperfection in Christ's sufferings which he, or any one else, could supply, as the Romanists profanely teach, but that there was as yet imperfection *in his own* measure of sufferings in behalf of the church, and that as yet *he fell short* of the standard which Christ's sufferings in behalf of the church displayed, and which was erected for the *example* of his people. "For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps." "The apostle seems to mean," continues Mr. Barnes, "that he suffered in the same cause as that for which Christ suffered; that he endured the same kind of sufferings, to some extent, in reproaches, persecutions, and oppositions from the world; that he had not yet suffered *as much* as Christ did in this cause, and though he had suffered greatly, yet there was much that was lacking, to make him equal in this respect to the Savior; and that he felt it was an object to be earnestly desired to be made in all respects *just like Christ*, and that in his present circumstances he was fast filling up that which was lacking, so that he would have a more complete resemblance to him. What he says here is based on the leading desire of his soul—the great principle of his life—TO BE JUST LIKE CHRIST: alike in moral character, in suffering, and in destiny." He concludes his note by saying, "this seems to me to be the fair meaning of this expression, though not the one commonly given. The usual interpretation is, 'that which remains to me of affliction to be endured in the cause of Christ.' But this seems to me to be cold and tame, and not to suit the genius of Paul.* The apostle could not use more plain and more emphatic language to convey his views of the principle of Christ's sufferings. In his view they were *exemplary, not* expiatory. He could not have believed that they had an expiatory character, or he never would have *compared* his own sufferings with those of his Master, and desired even in the experience of sufferings and death "to be just like Christ." It is in harmony with *this* view of the sufferings of Christ, but *not* surely with the *popular* view, that Paul should thus write to the Corinthian church, "for as *the sufferings of Christ abound in us*, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ."

In the light of this very obvious and scriptural view of the sufferings of Christ, we see the greater appropriateness and force of that scripture exhortation to take up the Cross and follow Christ,—"if any man will be my disciple, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross*, and follow me." This language was addressed by our Lord to his disciples

* Dr. Adam Clarke strives to evade the force of this text by the following hypercriticism:—"It is worthy of remark, that the apostle does not say *pathemata*, the *passion* of Christ, but simply *thlipseis*, the *afflictions;* such as are common to all good men who bear testimony against the ways and fashions of a wicked world. In these the apostle had his share—in the *passion* of Christ he could have none." So says Dr. Adam Clarke, but Paul has spoken for himself, and has flatly contradicted the learned divine:—"That I may know him . . . and the *fellowship* (or *participation*) *of his sufferings*," (*pathemata* in the genitive plural.) Again, "for as *the sufferings* (*pathemata*) *of Christ abound in us*." Again, "rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings" (*pathemata*,)—1 Peter 4 : 13, and elsewhere. Surely the doctor could not have been ignorant of the fact that *pathema* and *thlipsis* are exchangeable terms. The Greek scholar may see a proof of this in 2 Corinth. 1 : 6. Indeed the verse before us supplies an example, for *pathema* is the word which the apostle uses in the former part of the verse, "my *sufferings* for you," which is clearly of the same verbal value as "*afflictions*" in the latter part of the verse. Dr. Macknight tries to get out of the difficulty by a different piece of gratuitous criticism. "The phrase 'afflictions of Christ,' in this passage, being the genitive of the agent, signifies, not the afflictions which Christ suffered, but the afflictions which he appointed the apostle to suffer for building the church." On what ground does the learned doctor deny that this phrase is the *genitive of possession?* Not on a grammatical, but on an *exegetical* ground. Its interpretation as a genitive of *possession* makes against the popular theology, hence with a license, not uncommon among theological grammarians, Dr. Macknight gratuitously asserts that it is "the genitive of the agent." With as much grammatical reason might he assert that 1 Peter 5 : 1, Romans 8 : 18, where the phrases "sufferings of Christ," and "sufferings of this present time" occur, are examples of "the genitive of the agent," as the phrase "afflictions of Christ," in Col. 1 : 24, for the grammatical construction is the same.

under the following circumstances :—For the first time Jesus informed his disciples that he would be delivered up into the hands of wicked men, and would be put to a violent death. The ardent and affectionate Peter exclaimed, "this be far from thee, Lord, this shall not happen to thee!" He did not perceive how much impiety his words expressed, and hence his Lord's stern rebuke, "Get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me, for thou savorest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men." And then followed the declaration—"If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and *take up his cross*, and follow me." As if our Lord had said, "I will not shrink from the consequences of duty, however painful and extreme they may be, as your words, Peter, seem to counsel. If my resistance of sin, my maintenance of a perfect righteousness, and my devotion to the ends of my heavenly mission shall cost me my life, then I am prepared to 'resist' sin even 'unto blood,'—I will be 'obedient even unto death.' And I say unto you, my disciples, if you, or any man will follow me, he must be prepared for a similar fate and a similar faithfulness. 'The servant is not greater than his master; if they have persecuted me they will also persecute you, if they have kept my saying they will keep yours also.' You must, like me, for duty's sake, deny yourself and take up your cross, if you will follow me.' On the theory of popular christianity, this language is singularly strange and inconsistent. The cross of the "orthodox" churches is the symbol of ideas exclusively identified with Christ as the fulfiller in behalf of the human race, of a mission, which the moral government of God demanded, and which they could not fulfil themselves. It symbolizes the competency to do and suffer, what Divine justice made indispensable to the forgiveness of men's sins and their acceptance with God, but for which mankind are wholly incompetent. Its voice is the voice of sin visited vicariously with Divine vengeance;—of justice asserting and receiving through a substitute, the satisfaction of its claims. In this view it sustains no other relation to mankind than that of a scheme of Divine benefaction. Man may gaze thereon—he is called upon to acquiesce and hope therein—but he must not touch. He must stand far off, and smite upon his breast in trembling and trustful awe. Christ alone can touch the cross—he alone can "take up" the cross, because he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions. The cross may be man's hope, but not his *heritage*. And yet the christianity of the New Testament makes it his *inheritance!* According to Christ's teaching and that of his apostles, man himself must *have a cross*—and "*take up his cross*"—and "bear his cross," and endure his cross! Man, like his great model, must be "crucified to the world"—he must take up his cross daily, and follow or imitate his crucified Lord. He must "*suffer with*" Christ, if he hopes to "reign with" him. But man cannot become a substitute for the sins of the world, endure the pressure of omnipotent wrath, give satisfaction to Divine justice! Then how can he "take up his cross and follow" Christ? How can he "suffer with" Christ? The popular theory again fails. In the view of this scripture requirement it stands in obvious contrast, and consequent condemnation. The idea of *expiation* cannot enter into its doctrinal significance, for only on the supposition that Christ bore his cross as the world's wicked recompense of his perfect righteousness, can the sons of men be called upon *to take up their cross, imitate,* and *suffer with* him.

The language of Paul in his epistle to the Philippians, ch. 3 : 10, is very explicit, and decisive of the point at issue. The apostle gloried that he had "suffered the loss of all things" for Christ, because those sufferings gave him *a common experience* with Christ. His great ambition was "the excellency of the *knowledge* of Christ Jesus" his Lord, hence he says, "I count all things but loss . . . . that I may *know* him (by having a similar experience) and *the fellowship of his sufferings*, being made *conformable to his death.*" If Christ's "sufferings" and "death" were *expiatory*, how could Paul suppose that his sufferings could be in "fellowship" with those of Christ, and *his* death be "conformable to," or resemble Christ's death? And yet this is what he does suppose and desire. He gloried in his sufferings for righteousness' sake, because he was thus enabled to "*know*" Christ more intimately and experimentally, whose sufferings were endured in like manner. And should he die in testifying for the gospel of Christ, he would "suffer *with*" Christ, and his death would be "conformable unto," or in resemblance of Christ's death. Such is obviously the force of his language, and in conformity with the same sentiment he speaks of, believers generally, as "planted together *in the likeness of his* (Christ's) *death.*" The experience of Christ and his disciples is one in principle when they suffer for righteousness' sake, and one in actual fact, when, like their master, their uncompromising fidelity costs them their life's blood. Then they drink of the cup that he drank of, and are baptized with the baptism wherewith he was baptized.

A DISCLAIMER.

BY C. F. HUDSON.

CINCINNATI, April 3, 1854.

DEAR BR. STORRS—I must confess to a little disappointment since I wrote to you; and, confiding in your honor and integrity as a Christian brother, I will, without much prologue, plunge "*in medias res*," and state my position, and the grievances to which, undesignedly, you are subjecting me.

I stated, in my letter to Br. Chittenden (whose name was given me by a friend) that, for certain reasons, I had stood aloof from the Storrs' movement. Those reasons were as follows :—By means of a copy of the "Storrs' Miscellany," I obtained a list of your publications, some of which I sent for. Although they contained some unanswerable arguments, still I did not, on the whole, like them. The "Anthropos" of your Miscellany seemed to me too true to his *nomme de plume;* and his argument left him, I thought, too much at the mercy of the *mere* anthropologist. Friend Read, on the "Immateriality of the Soul," seemed to me to prove its Insubstantiality as much as anything else. And the pamphlets I received seemed to me to tend

clearly to materialistic views. I was inclined also to criticise the tone and temper of some of the writers, though knowing their position as somewhat slandered, I could forgive a good deal in that way. And yet I could not but say, these publications will convince mainly the disaffected, and those ready to quarrel with orthodoxy; and the style of belief which grows out of this branch of the movement will be negative rather than positive, as has been the whole Unitarian and Universalist movement. And among a large class of the best sort of Christian people, I could not more effectually confirm the common doctrine, than by circulating these books, on the principle of counter irritation.

And thus, knowing the tendencies of a heterodox position, and that a breach with the Church visible may be followed by wild and radical error, I was not prepared to dispute the assertion when I heard the strangest things said of Br. Storrs: things which of course added to my deep regret at the unwise and indefensible position of so many of my brethren. I had no doubt but for the apparent drifting of many of them towards materialism, I should have met a less summary fate at the hands of my Association,—though other influences, clearly observable, set in to hasten them to an unwarranted judgment. That, however, is between me and them.

I was undeceived of these strange reports, and inclined to a more hopeful view of your course, by reading your Hartford Convention speech, and by what Br. V. told me of you. And writing to Br. C., and failing to hear from him, I wrote to you as I did. Your letter in reply made me still more hopeful.

But some things in the style of the EXAMINER for March 1, which I received shortly after, were not to my taste, and I was prepared to feel injustice done me by your issue of March 15. And, finally, looking over the numbers for January and February, I am more desponding than ever. And for reasons briefly thus:

My letter was on the whole a private letter; and although I gave you a kind of implied liberty to publish the "copies" I sent you, anonymously, I stated expressly that my book was in no state for proclamation. And then my school and other private schemes were my own rather than the people's.

Again, the portion of my letter which you have published is just that which is least theological; and of the rest, which your letter takes special notice of, nothing is said or intimated in your paper. If you did not think it worth while to publish my criticisms (and I had no claim upon your doing so,) you should at least not ignore them in such a way as to put me in a false position. This I think you have done.

For I do dissent, *in toto*, from the materialistic view which I find to pervade your paper. And although you and your contributors do sincerely disclaim the epithet of "materialists," and are as far as need be from the materialism of the Deist or the Atheist, still you do, as I conceive, hold a position that is philosophically difficult, and utterly untenable and unrequired by the Divine Word.—As brethren in Christ, and holding the same hope of eternal life, I can heartily welcome you, and bid you God speed. But as philosophers and interpreters, I must predict you ill success,—and must advise you that you have unwittingly wronged me, by not stating my dissent from your philosophy of the nature of the soul. Even on the lower ground of expediency, I have a right to ask that you should not compromise the little influence I may have with some who have heretofore regarded me as capable of analysis. I know, indeed, that between two fires, I shall come forth the brighter, if I am sound and unhurt; for, on the other hand, I have some suspicions of rationalism to outlive, and am willing to bide my time to dispel them. Hence the matter of *expediency* is one for which I care but little. But it is my *right*, and the cause of truth demands, that I should not be involved in a view from which I expressly dissent; for though I do not charge upon you the *inferences* which I draw, and which others are drawing, from your views, still my disclaimer of your premises is the only thing that can set me fair, before multitudes whom I would fain persuade to trust in Christ, as the only and gracious author of eternal being to man, by the sacrifice and redemption he has made.

The points on which I dissent from what I observe to be the tenor of many of your contributions, would be raised by one or two questions—on which I might express my views, if time permitted, viz.:

IS THE SOUL MATERIAL?

Is there in the universe no other substance besides matter?

Is the intermediate state a state of annihilation? or, are believers destroyed at death and re-created at the resurrection?

I must say, also, that the views of the redemption, which appear in the Essays on the Doctrine of the Cross, by Mr. Ham, are such as I must explicitly disown, and I have never supposed that the doctrine of Christ, as the Life-Giver, was to be carried out in such a way as to exclude the idea of Christ as a Ransom. The imperfection of our human forensic language, was never designed to give occasion for those who would deny the "Lord that bought us."

The criticisms of *taste*, of which I spoke above, are comparatively unimportant matters. I may state them at another time, if it shall seem best. Praying that the Lord of all wisdom may direct those who would establish his truth, I am yours, in the love of Christ. C. F. HUDSON.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR:—We give place to the foregoing letter, in justice to Br. Hudson; but, in justice to ourself, we must say, that our *principal* reason for not inserting the part of his previous letter, in which he disclaimed "materialism," was, that previous to receiving the letter we had selected his communication from the Chicago paper for the EXAMINER, without abridging it, and we wished to insert the two anonymous letters he sent us, which could not well be done without an extract from the letter that accompanied them; and as those anonymous letters stated *the fact* that Br.

Hudson's views were not "materialistic," we thought that part of his letter might best be omitted; and we omitted it to abridge the space the whole would occupy. We hope this apology will exculpate us, in Br. Hudson's mind, from any intention to do him injustice; and we are sure it will.

The preceding letter we have not felt at liberty to alter or abridge. We regret having "proclaimed" Br. H.'s "book" before he designed it; that was an error in us; but if it should hasten it to its birth, our mistake may be over-ruled for good; because, if we are in error in our "materialistic" views of man, and his origin, the sooner we are set right the better for us and for all. We do not believe we are so callous yet but that we can feel the force of argument, especially if it comes with a "*Thus saith the Lord.*" Unless it is backed up with such authority it will fail of reaching our mind. If Br. H. has such authority, none will more readily or cheerfully receive it than ourself. But whether we can harmonize on that point or not, we do rejoice, and we will rejoice that he has learned that immortality, eternal life, is "the *gift* of God through Jesus Christ," and that "all the wicked will God destroy."

We can feel for Br. H.'s position in relation to what is called "materialism." When we first embraced the views of man's essential mortality, and indeed, up to the time we preached our Six Sermons, in 1842, we felt pained at any suggestion that our views were in any way connected with *materialism.*

There are two kinds of materialism; and of this Br. Hudson seems aware, and we trust he will be still more so after awhile. There is a materialism which denies all spiritual existence. That materialism, of course, is highly fatal to any just views of God, and must reject the possibility of a future life to man; hence it rejects the resurrection altogether. With such materialism we have no sympathy; it is purely *sensual, devilish.* But, shall we therefore reject the Scripture doctrine that the Lord God formed *man,* and every other creature that lives by breathing, on earth, "out of the dust of the ground." That is, He formed man of *matter*—made him a *material* being: and the apostle declares, "The first man is of *the earth,* earthy"—1 Cor. 15 : 47. And Jesus our Lord declares, in the most solemn manner, "That which is born of the flesh *is flesh*:"—John 3 : 6. Hence the necessity of being born again of the Spirit. Till that birth takes place—or, at least, till we are *begotten* again by the Spirit of God—men, any man, all men, are animal, material, and only such. But every creature on earth, that lives by breathing, has sensation and various degrees of intelligence, according to the organism that God has seen fit to give them. It is the material organism which determines the degree of intelligence of which each creature is capable. If this is not so, let it be shown by reason, philosophy, or Scripture; especially the latter.

It is at the resurrection the followers of Christ become *spiritual,* in the *full* scripture sense of the term. But then they are not *immaterial,* but are in possession of "a spiritual body:"—1 Cor. 15 : 44. They are *bodies,* though spiritual. This fact, at least, demonstrates, that immateriality is not essential to spiritual. Hence a denial of *immateriality* is not a denial of scripture spirituality, though it may be a denial of *scholastic* spirituality. If Br. Hudson is disposed to "express his views" on the questions noted in the conclusion of his letter, he shall have a reasonable space in the EXAMINER to do so; at the same time we would suggest—as it would much aid us all to an understanding of the matter—that he take up a previous question, viz.:

Has the creature Man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, a distinct entity, above and besides, called the soul?

When this question is settled, by scripture authority, then the question of its materiality—if such a soul is found to exist—will be a legitimate one. Till then, it looks to us impossible to arrive at a satisfactory solution of Br. H.'s first question, because it would be reasoning from an *assumption* that man has that distinct entity.

As to his third question, we regard it as uncalled for in this controversy, as we know of no one who believes the "intermediate state" is "a state of annihilation," or that "believers are destroyed at death, and re-created at the resurrection." We believe that, "believers at death sleep in Jesus," and that that state is one of rest, in silence, till the voice of Christ shall call them into life, as he called Lazarus from the dead. We have no idea they are annihilated or destroyed at death; but the fact that they are not, is not because there is anything in their constitution or nature, *as men,* to prevent such a result, but because God purposes their revival from death, or sleep; and His power can accomplish what He wills, however astonishing it may seem to human minds.

One remark more. Br. Hudson certainly misapprehends Br. Ham, if he supposes he "excludes the idea of Christ as a Ransom." And we trust he will be convinced of that when he has read Br. Ham's letter in the last EXAMINER, and the remaining articles yet to appear; though we are aware Br. Hudson has not had the advantage of the

whole argument, as he has not seen, we presume, any of the articles previous to this year's EXAMINER.

In conclusion, we sincerely hope and pray that all of us who are believers in Immortality, Eternal Life *only* through Jesus Christ, may be actuated in all we say, or write, by the one desire to honor him who gave himself to suffering and sorrow, even unto death, that he might *redeem* us from *all iniquity*, thereby preparing us for *redemption* from death into Eternal Life. If we strive only for mastery, we shall verily have our reward, but that reward will not be eternal life. *Love* is the fulfilling of the law. We now "know in part" only, and are all liable to err more or less: hence, to set up our particular views as a standard, for others, and to maintain that our views are essential to be embraced, in order to life everlasting, is an assumption over the faith of others, which we think is not in harmony with that charity [*love*] which an apostle enjoined, and which Christ, our Lord and Life Giver, taught us to be the badge of discipleship.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, APRIL 15, 1854.

THE CONFLICT.

REVIEW OF PROF. MATTISON.—BY THE EDITOR.

In our last, we brought our remarks to the point where the Prof. gave us the "properties of matter," with the affirmation that "The soul of man has none of these properties." He adds:

"You cannot see or handle it: you cannot weigh or measure it. The spirit hath sensation, memory, can joy, fear and hope. Matter cannot do this."

Matter, then, however organized, cannot do any of these things. But it is perfectly manifest that any creature that lives by *breathing* can do them all: hence must have the spirit or soul the Prof. speaks of, if his theory be true. This fact he feels, and tries to escape the awkwardness of the position by saying:

"Beasts, in a certain degree, have spiritual natures; but theirs is entombed with them, while man's continues to live on."

A spiritual nature, then, *may* be entombed. If the spiritual nature of a *sheep* may be entombed, why may not the spiritual nature of man? for the Psalmist saith of wicked men, "*Like sheep* they are laid in the grave."—Ps. 49 : 14; and again he saith, verses 12 and 20, "He is like the *beasts* that perish." Did "David in spirit" utter truth? or shall he stand corrected by modern theology? What evidence has the Prof. given that "man's spiritual nature continues to live on?" He next remarks:

"You may construct a machine that will turn a last, or even make pins; but can you give it intelligence?"

Truly not, brother M.; and *you* might make a "calf," as Aaron did; but could you make it breathe or eat? Does that prove that God could not make one that could do both? Again, saith the Prof.:

"View a factory with its thousand spindles, each performing its allotted task almost like a thing of life. But have those spindles sensation? consciousness? No. Why not? The iron in those spindles is the same which courses in my blood."

We wish friend Mattison had answered the question, "Why not?" But as he has not, it may be proper to answer it for him. Spindles have no adaptation in their construction for the purpose of consciousness. So far as we have knowledge, there is nothing which has an adaptation to develop consciousness except that which has an organism designed to develop *life by breathing*. Why cannot a "spindle" breathe, Br. M.? Answer that question and you answer your own. Again saith the Prof.:

"It is in the interpretation of Gen. 3 : 19, that the advocates of this new theory first stumble. That *only* which was of the dust was to return to it. But Adam was something besides dust: What did God breathe into his nostrils? Did He blow *dust* into them? It was the immortal soul."

Did the Lord "*blow* an immortal soul" into man's "nostrils," Br. M.? It is easy to make a witty remark to excite a smile at an opponent; but not so easy, always, to give proof of an assumption. Where is the evidence that God breathed an immortal soul into man's nostrils? or any soul, mortal or immortal? We want just one text.—The Lord God breathed the *breath* of life into his nostrils, and "*man*—formed of the dust of the ground—became a living soul." Not, became *possessed* of an immortal soul, or any soul; but *he—the man*, formed as described—*became a living soul*. Such is the testimony; and when "his breath goeth forth *he* returneth to *his* earth: in that very day *his thoughts perish*:"—Ps. 146 : 4. His Maker and Judge said to *the man*—not to a body merely—"dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return."—Gen. 3 : 19. There is no "stumbling" here on our part, Prof.: the stumbling, if any, is on the side of the *assumers* of man's inherent immortality—or man's possession of an immortal soul. In proof of the Professor's last assumption he speaks thus:

"'The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit.' If our spirit in this text is material, the Spirit of God must be so too. God is a spirit, and must be worshipped in spirit and in truth. If the spirit worshipping be material, why not the Spirit worshipped be so too?"

When have we ever denied that man has a spir-

it? or affirmed that that spirit is material? The question is, Is the spirit of man an entity, or a distinct being from the man? can it live and have intelligence when man has returned to dust? and is it immortal? Till you settle these points you may "blow dust" into men's *eyes*, but you do not touch the question at issue. "God is a Spirit," or, *spiritual*, in distinction from the Temple "at Jerusalem, where," the Jews said, "men ought to worship"—in distinction from those "*carnal* ordinances," which were to be "done away." Christ taught the woman of Samaria that God was not to be worshipped with men's hands, like the idols, or like the mere external worship of the formal Jews; but that *He* required men to give Him their *affections*, or heart: and that no service where this was lacking was a service in truth. But brother M. adds:

"'The body without the spirit is dead,' plainly proves that man has a living spirit within him."

The whole text reads thus: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, *so* faith without works is dead also." How does this prove man has a living spirit in him that does not die as well as the body? The fact is, whether we can "translate Hebrew or Greek" or not, the Translators have themselves inserted "*breath*," in the margin. And Dr. Adam Clarke says the marginal readings, in a majority of instances, are preferable to the text. How then does this text "prove man has a living spirit within him?" Try again, Br. M. There is nothing like trying, to show one his errors and mistakes. It seems to us you would not have traveled from Genesis almost to Revelation for proof of your theory, if you could have found it nearer the third chapter of Genesis, where you said we first stumble. You seem to have stumbled a long way to find a text, which, after all, demolishes your own theory: for Moses saith, the Lord God breathed into man's nostrils the *breath* of life and man became a living soul; and James saith, "the body without the *breath* is dead." Is the breath "a living conscious spirit?" If so, the spirit must be material. But our Prof. grows warm, and says:

"This worse than Universalian doctrine, would not only blot out of being all spiritual existences—not only would it make the whole of God's creation, between heaven, His throne, and earth His footstool, one vast empty space, but goes far towards obliterating the very idea of a God."

We suppose this outburst, at closing his first discourse, was intended to "warm up" the dish that it might give a relish to the performance.—But perhaps we are mistaken in the design. Universalism is in harmony with the Professor, except in the final result: and hence we should expect he and his coadjutors would give them the preference to us, who believe immortality is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and bestowed only on the holy, while "All the wicked will God destroy:"—Ps. 145 : 20. But we ask the Prof., what else His theory of spirits makes "the whole of God's creation, between heaven, His throne, and earth his footstool," but "one vast empty space?" What is a spirit, according to the Prof.? He says, It has neither *form*, *weight*, nor *color*, and CANNOT BE SEEN, *felt*, nor *measured*. Now how much "space," would any number of such fill? We think the Prof. has made a little mistake. It is *his theory* that leaves the universe of God "one vast empty space." Ours occupies it, at God's good pleasure, with substantial beings, that can be seen and felt. And we trust, by and by, to "see Jesus as he is, and be like him:"—1 John 3 : 2; yea, to have "our vile *body* changed, and fashioned like to his glorious *body*:"—Phil. 3 : 21.

We have now concluded our Review of Br. Mattison's first discourse, and hope we have said nothing that shall give unnecessary offence to him; presuming that his object is truth, as well as our own. May the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—our Life-Giver—lead us into all truth, and save as from all that would dishonor His name, injure His cause, or be hurtful to our dying fellow-men. Let us all remember it is but a small matter that we hold the truth, if it does not control our hearts and lives. We may hold the truth in unrighteousness. We do this when we do not give it a continual influence in all our ways; and when we so live as to give men reason to think we disregard the truths we hold. Better would it be for us not to know what truth is than having known it, to fail of conforming to it in all things.

DEFENCE OF THE BIBLE.

[The following is from our fourth speech in the Hartford Bible Convention of June last.—ED. EX.]

The great theme before this Convention is the trial of the Bible. It is said that we come here and repeat over and over again things we have said before—that we manifestly come here with nothing to say. I ask if in this respect we have differed essentially from our friends on the opposite side of the question? We labored at the outset of this Convention to see if there was a law by which the Bible could be tried, and after laboring for nearly two days we consented, for the sake of having the argument go on, that the law adduced should be the law by which the Bible should be tried, and that law was stated to be natural reli-

gion, or the God of nature. By the religion of nature, or the religion of the God of nature, the Bible and the God of the Bible are to be tried. Then I endeavored to show the congregation, last evening, that in this trial the God of the Bible suffered nothing in comparison with the God of nature; and if that was to be the rule by which the God of the Bible was to be tried, either the God of the Bible must go clear, or the God of nature was in the same condemnation. My friend Mr. Wright has felt, I have no doubt, the force of that remark; therefore he has labored very hard to acquit the God of nature, and to bring out fresh charges against the God of the Bible. The Bible, he says, represents God as ruling the world by arbitrary laws and penalties. He affirms that the God of nature does not rule the world by arbitrary laws and penalties. Am I right in saying that you affirm it?

Mr. Wright—Yes, I do affirm it.

Mr. Storrs—Sir, what law by which the God of nature rules the world does he ever change? What penalty that the God of nature has affixed to his laws does he ever alter? If that is not arbitrary law—arbitrary penalty, I ask to know what is? One of the very charges which they bring against the God of the Bible is, that he does sometimes change his laws; therefore the law, speaking in the most absolute sense, is not arbitrary, but it is subject to be changed by the Author of that law, while the God of nature is unchanged and unchangeable in his laws and in his penalties.

Mr. Wright—I desire to say that I used the terms fixed laws and fixed penalties, and arbitrary laws and arbitrary penalties, as laws and penalties that are opposed to each other.

Mr. Storrs—Fixed fast in fate? Then what are you but the mere machinery of the God of nature? But "the God of the Bible is a very cruel God." The God of the Bible is represented as "commanding parents to stone the child to death. Abraham is commanded to butcher his son;" and, says my friend Wright, "I have been asked if I would do such a deed if God commanded it? No, I would not; but I would *cut the throat of such a God.*" Well, I was a little surprised at that remark of my good friend Wright, because, formerly, when a *follower of Jesus*, he was a peace-man—a non-resistant. (Applause.) Formerly, if a man should take his child and dash out its brains before his eyes, he would not strike him to keep him from doing it; but he has changed since he has become a worshiper of the God of nature, and is now a war-man to the knife.

Mr. Wright—I wish my friends to keep in mind, distinctly and emphatically, that by that form of speech I desired to show that I do not believe in the existence of any such being as a God who ever did command men to take the life of any human being. I do not believe that in cutting the throat of such a God, I would be cutting the throat of anything more than a mere metaphorical God.

Mr. Storrs—I deny that the God of the Bible ever commanded Abraham to butcher his son.—He told him, indeed, to go and offer him up as a burnt-offering; but when Abraham took hold of the knife, God commanded him to stop. He had gone beyond what he told him to do. But my friend Wright will have to butcher his God, and cut his throat as sure as life; because the God of nature has given the *command* to delicate mothers, and *compelled* them to *butcher* their own children, and *eat* them too. Is it, or is it not a fact that in sieges of cities, where they have been driven to desperation for the lack of food, mothers have killed their own children, and eaten them to preserve their own life? What was it that commanded them to this? *The God of nature!* (Applause.) The God of nature, when he saw that they were like to starve to death, commanded them to "butcher" their children, and they actually did butcher them. Has the God of the Bible done anything worse than that? No, sir. The God of nature has shown himself to be altogether as guilty as the God of the Bible; and if my friend Wright is true to his declaration, he will have to take his knife and cut the throat of his God of nature. "The God of nature," he says, "never did send earthquakes to kill men—earthquakes are natural omens." They are then the *natural actions*, I suppose, of the God of nature; are they? If it is not understood in this way, I confess myself incapable of telling how it is understood.

Mr. Wright—My remark is, that earthquakes are the effects of natural causes.

Mr. Storrs—Who constituted those natural causes? (Applause.) The God of nature, I suppose. (Applause.) Does his God escape? "The God of nature, in these natural causes, did not kill these inhabitants in these cities; oh no—they only put themselves right across where his car came!" But, sir, the God of nature drove his car right through their cities, and never gave them the least notice that he was coming. Surely that was almost as bad as going into the draw at Norwalk. (Laughter.) This God of nature having established in his works, natural causes, which produce earthquakes that will swallow up cities if they happen to be planted in a certain place, if he was a good God, one would seem to think that he would have sent some notice to the children of men, and

tell them not to build the city, for his car of an earthquake was going to plow through there. But, sir, he leaves them in total ignorance, and allows them to plant their cities, and go on to great happiness and prosperity; and then, without a solitary warning, the God of nature drives his plow of destruction through their streets.

But our friend Wright is very accommodating to the God of nature. If he were half as accommodating to the God of the Bible, he would not find so much difficulty. I should like to know what can be found in that manifestation of the God of nature that goes to prove his goodness. Can the God of nature speak to men really in any way possible? If he can, why did he not give them some notice that he was going to destroy such a section of country, and that therefore they must must move away from it, else he would destroy their lives? How good he must be to destroy all their labors, and destroy their families! "But the man would not have been hurt when the lightning fell from heaven, if he had not been in the way of it." Indeed he would not! But did the God of nature tell him, when he was walking along, that he was going to get in the way below? Did he not suffer him to go on, and dash him to death in a moment?

Now, suppose we should make such a defence of the God of the Bible. The God of the Bible, when he divided the earth among the children of men, divided a certain portion to the children of Israel. He determined to establish that people in that land; but here is another class of men that come along, and plant themselves down in the land of Canaan, to possess the land that God had designed for a particular people. Instead of keeping their own inheritance, they plant themselves there in that land. The time comes when the God of the Bible is determined to put his people in possession of the land which he reserved for them at the creation.

Now, sir, what does he do? Why, it is true he does not send an earthquake through the land, and take them all by surprise. Did he give them no notice of what he is going to do? At first, he waited until their corruption was such, in wickedness, that they were no longer to be endured. He had previously informed Abraham (see Gen. 15: 16) that the reason why he would not at an earlier period cut off the intruders in Canaan was, that "their iniquity was not yet full." But when it was full, and God's purpose to put Abraham's seed in possession of the long-promised land was now to be accomplished, he does not take them by surprise; he gives them forty years' notice that he is going to dispossess them. And during that forty years he performs certain miracles or actions which were designed to convey to the inhabitants of the land that fact, that the God of the Bible was determined to bring a people in there, to whom that land belonged. He gave them timely notice of it; and they who were believing saved their lives, as Rahab and her family. But all did not believe. Suppose, then, that he commissioned His people to destroy that people out of the land, has he done any thing worse than the God of nature, who destroyed the cities we spoke of? The question is not whether we can defend the God of the Bible, but whether he can be defended in view of the law by which he is to be tried. We might make the same remark in regard to pestilence.

Our friend Wright told us that this, too, was a a natural affair; but suppose it is a natural affair —suppose it is in the course of nature, I ask again, who controls that course of nature? Is it the God of nature? and if so, I ask if the God of nature is not chargeable with this terrible crime of sweeping millions of the human race away by the most desolating pestilence?

Just here, at this point, I beg leave to be permitted to read a little from some eminent men on the other side of the question. The names of Hume and Bolingbroke are well known by my friends on the opposite side of the question. Here let me say, that I do not despise any man for being a Deist. I do not use the term Deist ever reproachfully. It is simply one who rejects what we denominate revelation. He believes in God, and revelations of the God of nature. I can not wonder that there are so many Deists in the world, when they suppose that the God of the Bible will do certain things which are attributed to him. I wonder that the whole world are not Deists under the theology in which we have been trained.—(Hear, hear.) But if we have the time, we will show that these most objectionable doctrines, which have led so many into the rejection of revelation, have no foundation in the Bible. [The speaker read from Mr. Hume's "Essay on Providence and the Future State," as found in "Dr. M'Culloh's Analytical Investigations concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures," vol. i., p. 97.]

"Allowing the gods to be the authors of the existence or order of the universe, it follows that they possess that precise degree of *power, intelligence, and benevolence which appears in their workmanship*; but nothing further can be proved, except we call in the assistance of exaggeration and flattery, to supply the defects of argument and reasoning. So far as the traces of any attributes at pre-

sent appear, so far we conclude that these attributes exist. *The supposition of further attributes is mere hypothesis;* much more the supposition that, in distant regions of space, or periods of time, there has been, or will be, a more magnificent display of those attributes, and a scheme of administration more suitable to such imaginary virtues."

Last night we were told to remember that the Bible says *yea*, and the Bible says *nay*. Now Mr. Hume, who is a Deist, says *yea*, and then the Deist here says *nay;* then their theology may be called in question as well as ours. [Wr. WRIGHT—To be sure.] And who shall decide? That is the question exactly. (Hear, hear.)

Again, Mr. Hume says: "The great source of our mistake in this subject, and of the unbounded license of conjecture which we indulge, is, that we tacitly consider ourselves as in the place of the Supreme Being, and conclude that he will, on every occasion, observe the same conduct which we ourselves, in his situation, would have embraced as reasonable and eligible. But besides that, the ordinary course of nature may convince us that almost everything is regulated by principles and maxims very different from ours; besides this, I say, it must evidently appear contrary to all rules of analogy, to reason from intentions and projects of man to those of a being so different, and so much superior. In human nature there is a certain experienced coherence of designs and inclinations, so that, when from any fact we have discovered one intention of any man, it may often be reasonable from experience to infer another, and draw a long chain of conclusions concerning his past or future conduct. But this method of reasoning can never have place with regard to a being so remote and incomprehensible (as God), who bears much less analogy to any other being in the universe than the sun to a waxen taper, and who discovers himself only by some faint traces or outlines, beyond which we have no authority to ascribe to him any attribute or perfection."

Lord Bolingbroke, in his Works, vol. iv., pp. 87, 88, says: "We are made able to arrive, by a proper exercise of our mental faculties, from a knowledge of God's works, to a knowledge of his existence, and of that infinite power and wisdom (intelligence) which are demonstrated to us in them. Our knowledge concerning God goes no further." Lord B. continues:—"We are in absolute ignorance of the real essence and inward constitution of every sensible object. How much less reason is there to expect any knowledge of the manner of the being, nature, and essence of the invisible God, or of his physical and moral attributes, beyond what his works, the effects of his nature and attributes, communicate to us? This degree, this sufficient degree of knowledge concerning God, is a fixed point, on one side of which lies Atheism, and metaphysical and theological blasphemy too often on the other."

Now I ask the congregation who have heard this morning, whether one Deist does not say *yea*, and the other *nay*—whether the God of nature is not as much at variance with himself as the God of the Bible?

There is one other point that I shall notice in the remarks of my friend Wright this morning, particularly. He tells us that Jesus was good—a good man. Thank him for that. He says that Jesus founded a sect. Any harm in that, friend Wright? [Mr. WRIGHT—Yes.] Very well, how did he found it? In any other way than you are founding a sect now? [Mr. WRIGHT—Yes.] *No.* Well, but what of that? Was the sect good at the outset? Yes; my friend Wright acknowledged that the persons concerned in it, at the outset, were good men. [Mr. WRIGHT—Yes.] I thank him. The men that were first concerned in founding this sect were good men, true men, faithful men, Christ-like men; and they demonstrated their integrity to the truth, by contending for the truth even unto death, at the hazard of their lives. What then? Since that period this sect have become corrupt, and done certain things injurious to society. I am rather glad my friend Wright said, that "those who *assume* to be this sect have had an injurious influence upon the world." Don't you say so, brother Wright?

MR. WRIGHT—Mr. Chairman, if it is proper to answer, I may answer; but yes or no would not express what I should want to say. I meant this, that those who profess to be guided by the spirit of Jesus, but have no more affinity to that spirit than Satan has, have perpetrated the foulest crimes. I do not believe that a man under the guidance of the spirit that Jesus had would ever commit those horrible sins.

Mr. STORRS—He says these men do not belong to Jesus. What, then, have they to do in pouring contumely upon this sect, or the system Jesus introduced? Why bring them to this stand, when he says himself that they have no affinity to Jesus? He has given us the argument. He has told us that Jesus was good—that the men to whom he committed this work were good and true men. He has now told us that those who *assume* to be of that class act just as contrary to Jesus and his first ministers, as Satan does to God. I will use the expression for him, although I do not know that he used it.

I will not now stop to investigate the fact whether Jesus did found a sect or not; but if he did found one, I ask upon what principles he founded it? My friend Wright will not deny but that the principles were right. He says that he was a man. Very well; suppose he was nothing but a man, then could he foresee that such glorious principles as he laid down would be corrupted and perverted, and entirely departed from, on the supposition that he founded a sect?

Now, sir, I ask again, what were the principles upon which he founded that sect? "Ye know," said Jesus, to these very men who were to preach his truth, "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise *lordship* over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so *it shall not be among you;* but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your servant," or minister; that is, one to minister to them—to do them that service which they might need for their welfare or happiness; but he charged them most solemnly that they should not exercise lordships over one another, and the Apostle Paul to the Gentiles comes forward, and in writing to the church at Corinth, says: "Not for that we have *dominion* over your *faith*, but are helpers of your joy."

Here, sir, are the principles of the founder—if you will have it so—of this sect; and I ask, sir, if it is not clear and plain that the founder of this sect, if it be a sect, did clearly denounce and condemn the course which those who "assume" to be of this sect have pursued for centuries past? Why, then, sir, are we cited, I ask again, to the wickedness of those *professing* to be of this sect, "who say they are Jews (Christians), but are not—but do lie?" Why are we cited to them as any reproach upon Christianity? "If Jesus was a good man," say you, "he ought to have known just such rascality would have come up." Indeed! but then you say that he was a man. I have answered my friend only on his own ground.

SPIRIT.

"But there is a spirit in man."—Job. 32 : 8.

To determine the import of the term Spirit, under every variety of circumstance in which it may be used in the Sacred Writings, is a task which neither our space nor our design warrant us to undertake.

Treatises commensurate with such a view of the subject already exist, and by a reference to these the reader can easily satisfy himself on those points which lie beyond the limits of the following remarks. Our present object is very simple, and concerns merely the question—*What is the Spirit of Man?* In answering which we are desirous of echoing only the testimony of Scripture, whose verdict we feel bound to regard as for ever decisive. And, as the language of our text is at once positive and direct, we would respectfully submit what appears to us its fair and natural meaning; a meaning, we presume, in strict harmony with the universal deliverances of both the Old and New Testament.

The statement reads: "But there is a Spirit in Man."

Now, the first thing which strikes us here is the evident distinction between the *Spirit* and the *Man*. To this distinction we wish particularly to call attention, inasmuch as the theory about the human spirit which now floats in the mind of Christendom, is borne up solely through an obstinate disregard of this plain scripture fact.

This will at once appear if we attend for a moment to the difference between the assertion that Man *is* a Spirit, or spiritual being; and the assertion that man *has* a spirit, a something which, while performing an essential function in his constitution, is not to be regarded as a distinct entity, according to the prevailing notion.

The former of these propositions, it will be seen, is plainly negatived by the latter; and as the proof of the one must necessarily be the refutation of the other, we will briefly adduce what seems to us clear and decided evidence in support of the proposition, which affirms, that *the spirit in man is only an attribute of his physical organism, and is in no respect to be regarded as capable of a separate and independent conscious existence.*

And here the term itself claims primary attention. The word Spirit, which, whatever may be the sense attached to it in actual usage, is the English equivalent for the Hebrew *ruach*, and the Greek *pneuma*, both of which, according to lexicographers, radically import *breath*. The term is used in a variety of senses throughout Scripture, but in every case, except when intended as a metaphor, when spoken of *Man*, it is to be held simply as a synonyme for *breath*.

The primary relation which this breath or spirit sustains to man is not intimated in the text, but as both the philosophy and the facts of human existence demonstrate this, we have only to reflect on the state of man when bereft of his breathing powers, or, as orthodox conventionalism would have it, "when his spirit has departed," in order to ascertain the exact nature of the union. Immediately breathing ceases, life is at an end, and all mental and moral faculties at once paralyzed. The function, then, of the breath or spirit in man, is no other than the maintenance of life, his deprivation of it producing the phenomenon we call *death*, which we hesitate not to pronounce complete in relation to all that constituted the sentient being.

Hence seems to have originated the phrase, "breath of life,"—breathing, or the respiration of the electrified air by the lungs, being essential to the life of all flesh (Gen. 6 : 17.)

This being the case, it is certainly not stretching language too far to speak of the breath or spirit as the "vital principle," or life-sustaining power, life being connected with the performance of its functions in the human system.

This will help to account for that class of passages where "spirit," which, as above defined, literally denotes *breath*, is spoken of as *the life itself*, and sometimes even as equivalent to *the whole man;* Man being regarded as consisting of "Soul, Body, and Spirit," or, more simply, as an organised being, kept alive by breathing, the withdrawal of which breath or spirit, resulting in nothing less than the total dissolution or annihilation of his conscious being. Hence Elihu, "If he (the Almighty) set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and

man shall turn again to dust."—Job 34 : 14, 15. And again the Psalmist, "His (man's) breath (or *spirit*) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146 : 4. So also Solomon, "Then (*at death*) shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (*or breath*) unto God who gave it."—Ecc. 12 : 7.

This view of the spirit of man may appear to some as inconsistent with such passages as ascribe to it *personality* and *intelligent* attributes.

To this we can only make the general reply, that though at first sight, inconsistent with *some* of the language employed, a careful examination of the real import of terms will satisfy an impartial reader, whose mind has not been wholly "spoiled through philosophy and vain deceit," that neither personality nor intelligence are to be attributed to the human spirit; but, rather, that the "spirit in man," being the principle or power through whose agency, in connection with the mechanical parts of the human organism, intelligence is produced and identity or personality maintained, they are *rhetorically* predicated of the Spirit itself.

This is clearly established by the fact, that in numerous instances personality and intelligence are alike referred to Soul, Body, and Spirit; as "*my* Soul," "*my* Flesh," "*my* Spirit;" so that if it be contended that the "*my*" in cases where *Spirit* is intended, proves its distinct intelligence and separate identity, then, on the same ground, we are authorised to maintain the essential personality and intelligence of Soul and Body; and Man, instead of being a simple self-conscious unity, is to be regarded as a *triune compound of consciousnesses*; which is, only in other words, to say, that man is three distinct persons,—an hypothesis at once unphilosophical, irrational, and unscriptural.

From all, then, which we can discover from the Book, we think we may safely presume that the "spirit in man" and the work it performs in his constitution, while indispensable to his existence and development, is no more independent of the laws which regulate this physical organism, than the liver which secretes bile, or the heart which propels the blood through his veins.

At this conclusion we can imagine many "orthodox believers" to start back in absolute despair, while the exclamations "infidelity" and "atheism" sound forth the pious horror which possess them at the thought, which divests man's nature of that mysterious and God-like principle, of which his future existence is supposed only to be predicable.

To such we would say, pause and reflect. The truth is even as we have said. But then—what then? Certainly not Despair! Not Infidelity! Not Atheism! Nay! If infidelity or atheism exist, it is all on the other side. For what is our position? Why this: That the popular grounds on which the hopes of futurity are reared, are altogether false and unscriptural!

Yea, and further, that till the delusion is dispelled, the mass of professed believers are without the shadow of a shade of evidence that there shall be any future state at all.

Platonic, or may we not rather say Satanic?—arguments, endorsing the "immortality of the Soul" or the "indestructibility of Spirit," may be adduced—Gen. 3 : 4, 5; but beyond this the creeds of Christendom at present think it not expedient to pass.

Infidelity, forsooth! Yes, 'tis, alas! too patent to be denied, for, what with immortal Soul and Spirit-ism, and other kindred creations of the pagan mind, Bible testimony is hushed—her august deliverances on the nature and destiny of Man silenced, and the groundless speculations of "divines" substituted in their room.

But this must end. The Bible is struggling to be heard again: and to aid her emancipation from the thraldom of the bigotry and intolerance under which she has been groaning during these centuries of darkness and superstition, we would here echo her voice on behalf of a mortal and death-doomed race—by announcing RESURRECTION and LIFE, as Heaven's one grand pledge for the redemption of humanity,—when, from the dark confines of oblivion the conqueror of Hades shall summon the candidates for "GLORY, HONOR, AND IMMORTALITY!"

J. H. S.

Moncrieff's Expositor.

PRAYER.

BY GEO. HILL, MERIDETH, N. Y.

The Object and Efficacy of Prayer.

The object of prayer is understood by a knowledge of prayer. Prayer consists of adoration and supplication. These united constitute true worship. Therefore the great object of prayer is to "worship God."

In proof of the assertion that prayer consists of adoration and supplication let us examine the Lord's prayer. The expression, "hallowed be thy name," is the highest form of adoration—the sentence, "thy will be done," is the purest expression of praise; and the request, "give us this day our daily bread," is the most humble, confiding and child-like supplication.

Having thus investigated the object of prayer, we come now to consider the efficacy of prayer. As its object is understood by a knowledge of prayer, so is its efficacy.

The efficacious power of prayer is in accordance with the spirit of supplicating love. If ye forgive not, neither can ye be forgiven. The reason why men ask and receive not, is because they ask not in the spirit of prayer. Praying always, is to maintain the spirit of supplicating in love, and of trusting in hope, and believing with confidence. If we possess the spirit of prayer, when we supplicate the forgiveness of our sins, we "shall obtain mercy;" and if we ask for "daily bread," it shall be "measured" to us according to our willingness to bestow on others. Therefore, "give to him that asketh," and do as you would have it done unto you: for so shalt thou receive, according to thy trustworthiness.

The christian spirit of prayer is to do to others in the same manner as ye would have it done to you, and to be as ye would have others be. This spiritual principle is that which produceth a reward, and also determines the kind of reward. God will grant all righteous requests made in the spirit of prayer, even to the plucking up of a mountain; and to ask in faith is to ask with that un-

derstanding of heart which would make the request a righteous one. We can never pray to God for that which is not in accordance with his will, because prayer is the desire of faith. Hence we conclude that the efficacy of prayer produceth a blessing.

From Dr. A. G. Case.

ZENAS, Ind., March 11, 1854.

BR. STORRS—I suppose you are not aware that it has been my practice to preach occasionally as duty requires. I endeavor, so far as I am able, to present in its purity the same gospel that Paul preached; viz: *Eternal life through Jesus Christ by the resurrection from the dead.* And I think my labors have been blessed of God to some extent.—While in Illinois last autumn, I attended an Universalist meeting, appointed for the exchange of views on the Scriptures. Professing to be a Bible loving people, they invited me to give my views of Scripture on the subject of Salvation; and I gave them a brief outline as commonly held by us. I spoke about fifteen minutes. Their preacher replied; and the result was a debate, in which he spoke twice and I three times. When I closed my last speech, he did not reply; so that closed the concern. I heard that he acknowledged himself beaten; but said it was because I made the attack from a new and unguarded point. He may well call it an "unguarded point," for so it is, and ever must be with them. An interest was awakened there on that occasion which, I am informed, still continues to live.

When I came here, the subject of the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked was entirely a new idea to the people, with now and then an exception. I have not seen but two who had ever thought of it. One of them said he had been strongly inclined that way for some time, but had said nothing about it. He is a member of the M. E. Church, and preaches sometimes. He has now put his hand to the plow, and says he has counted the cost and does not intend to look back. Amen.

I preached twice in this neighborhood, about three weeks ago, in a school-house: had more hearers than the house would hold—mixture of Baptists and Methodists. Met with some opposition, especially from the Baptists; but, notwithstanding, some of both churches are beginning to say they "see men as trees walking;" while others declare themselves satisfied that the sentiments preached are in accordance with the word of Divine Truth.

From Freeman Dillingham.

WEST BREWSTER, Mass., April 4, 1854.

BR. STORRS:—I was very sorry to hear of your loss by fire. I feel more interest in your periodical than in any one that I ever before have taken. The Life and Death theme—which you present before your readers—is the lever that will, under the blessing of God, finally triumph in putting down the popular doctrine of inherent immortality. I hope, my brother, that you will not at all be discouraged, but still go on and proclaim, "No immortality or endless life except through Jesus Christ." I am more than ever convinced that the popular churches, a majority of them, do not wish to hear or read anything on the subject; the ministry, because it is not popular with the people of their charge; and they would be quite likely to lose their support,— so they must be feeling the pulse of their churches and congregations, to know what will interest and suit them.

From an Old Man.

DEAR SIR—I had Storrs' Six Sermons some years ago. He preached at Ballston Springs; I heard him; got his Six Sermons, perused them, compared them with the Bible, and became a believer in the destruction of the wicked.

I am now in my 70th year; my health is poor, and time with me is short. I have been a member of the First Baptist Church in Stillwater more than fifty years. I still want more light on the Scriptures. If books on this subject were distributed in this section they would inform men, and would no doubt do good. I have not the means, only to a very limited extent, and therefore can do but little. I have Dobney on Future Punishment, and Blain's book, which I have lent freely to my neighbors. In some instances they have been read and compared with the Bible, and some are rejoicing in believing the truth. I lent Dobney's work to our former minister, who kept it, I should think, two months. When I called for it he had not read it at all. Some men are, as in ancient times, not willing to come to the light, lest their deeds should be reproved; and some are so attached to men's creeds and traditions—they do not seem to wish anything better; in fact, they seem to think there is nothing better. I lay this subject before all the ministers where I have opportunity; but of all men to be converted I think them the hardest, but when they are converted I hope they will strengthen their brethren. Mr. ——, from New York, put up with me for a night some time ago; I endeavored to cite passages of Scripture to him respecting the destruction of the wicked; he told me it was not the destruction of the being, but of the well-being. But I read, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil:" I think the Apostle in this passage is very explicit. *Destroy him,*—and then telling who *him* is, "that is, the devil." Also the Man of Sin, being personified, is to be destroyed. I think the word destroyed, in the Scriptures, means what it says; and to look over the scripture terms made use of in the Bible, does seem so plain—when applied to the wicked—I wonder how men, bearing the high or flattering titles given them by men, such as Rev. or D. D., can pass over them all, and say, they mean something else,—when it is said, thou shalt die—burn up—chaff cast into the fire—perish—utterly perish—devoured them—whose end is destruction—whose end is to be burned—devour the adversaries—second death. We know if continuation in misery was the meaning, it would have been set forth by different terms and expressions; but it seems to me the difficulty is in the belief that mortal man is immortal, that the soul cannot die—deathless spirit—and such like men-made expressions are put for Scripture; and our teachers have

taught us so—our traditionists think it is so; and how few look for themselves; they call some man, Father and Master; and are content not to search the Scriptures to see what is truth. Farewell.

DANIEL MUNGER.

Stillwater, Saratoga Co., N. Y.

Thoughts on Texts.

"For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."—1 Thess. 5: 9, 10.

The last part of this verse has been made to support the popular theory of a state of consciousness for the disembodied soul. A superficial reader, or one who detached this text from the scope of the Apostle's discourse, might, with his educational pre-conceptions, so interpret the passage. A careful consideration, however, of these words, in connection with the current reasoning of the Apostle, would conduct to a very different conclusion. In the previous chapter, Paul had been describing the circumstances of our Lord's second coming, for the comfort of certain bereaved Thessalonian believers, who seem to have imagined that those who should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," would have considerable advantages above those who were deceased. Paul assures them that these "shall not prevent (precede) them which are asleep;" that, on the contrary, "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and they who are "alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air," and so "ever be with the Lord." In allusion to what he had there been saying, Paul assures these Thessalonians that neither will have the advantage over the other with respect to immediate vision of the Lord and enjoyment of immortality—"*Whether we wake or sleep*," be among the living or the dead—is of no moment; Christ died for us that, be the case as it may, "*we should live together with him*" AT HIS COMING.

And thus Dr. Bloomfield, in his Greek Testament, expounds this text—"It is meant that whether we be alive or dead *that day*, it matters not; the living with Christ, or enjoying eternal happiness with him, shall be *equally* our portion."—*Editor Ch. Exr.*

"That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises."—*Heb.* 6: 12.

Some read this passage as if it affirmed that the departed saints, as disembodied spirits, were in the enjoyment of their heavenly rewards. But this cannot be its meaning, for such an exposition is plainly forbidden by a comparison with a subsequent place in this epistle. What this text asserts is, that there are those whose faith and patience have placed them in the company of them who inherit the *promises*—not the *fulfillment* of the promises, but *the promises to be at a future time fulfilled*. And hence this same epistle informs us, "These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*," that is the *fulfillment* of them. (Heb. 11: 13.) And again, "These all having obtained a good report through faith, *received not the promise*; God having provided some better thing for us, *that they without us should not be made perfect*." Heb. 11: 39, 40.—*Ibid.*

"TRANSLATION OF MATT. 16: 26."—Such is the heading of a short article in the *Advent Harbinger*, for April 8th, credited to *New York Chronicle*. We happen to know the *origin* of that article; and if the editor of the *Harbinger* had looked into the EXAMINER for Feb. 1st, he might have *guessed* its origin. Two copies of the EXAMINER, containing the original, were sent, by special request, to the *Chronicle*, from our office, and that paper copied the first part of it, with some trifling alterations—taking the above head-line, instead of ours, which was "MODERN DIVINITY." We were glad that the *Chronicle* published it in any form, and have no fault to find with it. The *Harbinger* also liked the taste of our neighbor, it seems, better than ours, and we have no right to complain of that. The truth goes, and we rejoice. If some cannot confess it openly, let them work in any way they like best: we claim that right, and mean to accord it to others. Perhaps Br. Marsh, when he comes to see the remainder of our article, from which the *Chronicle's* was an extract, will think well enough of it to give it in the *Harbinger*.

DONATIONS to our aid since April 1st:—Christian F. Bessenger, $2; Wm. Appleyard, $1; R. G. B. Woodard, $1; three ladies in Philadelphia, $5 each; Freeman Dillingham, $5; Henry Utley, $5; friends in Utica, by C. Swartwout, $7.

All these friends will accept our most unfeigned thanks for their kind remembrance of us. May the Lord enrich them all, more and more, with that grace which shall fit them for usefulness here and a part in His Kingdom, when He, "who was rich and for our sakes became poor," shall return in *His glory* with the holy angels.

If they could, any of them, send us *new* subscribers, for the present volume, with the pay in advance, it would relieve us to nearly the same amount as a donation, and be scattering the knowledge of the theme we advocate.

THE EXAMINER for April 1st was delayed by unavoidable circumstances, in going to press, nearly a week after it was put in type; in consequence of that delay, the present number is also behind time. We hope to be "up to time" in our issues soon.

"THE GREAT PROJECTS OF FRANCE."—The tract from which the article on this theme was taken, was written some months since, and seems now to be hastening to a fulfillment.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, MAY 1, 1854. NO. 9.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SOUL:

Or the Hebrew word Nephesh and Greek word Psuche.

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

NEPHESH. (*Hebrew Term.*)

SECTION I. *Nephesh*, a noun, is derived from the verb *Naphash*, which means to *breathe, expire.*

SEC. II. *Nephesh*, is, in the English version, translated *breath.*

Job 41: 21. "His breath (*naphesho*) kindleth coals." All animals, including man, "the paragon of animals," breathe the same element, the common air, sometimes by us called "the vital air," to distinguish it from other airs or gases which do not support life. In Ecc. 3: 19, it is said "they," men and animals, "have all one breath," or *ruach*, in the Hebrew; which term, here rendered "*breath*," is, in verse 21, of the same chapter, translated "*spirit*," and in many other places of the old Testament. When so used the force of *ruach* is equal to *nephesh*, when that term is employed to express *breath.*

Here verses 20 and 30, of Genesis I., may be considered for a moment. "And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving (margin, *creeping*) creature that hath life," (mar., *living soul*—Hebrew, *nephesh*) v. 20. Since *nephesh* means *breath*, the verse may be rendered "breath of life," as well as *living* soul, as in the margin, and, were it so rendered, the real meaning would be more obvious. Soul of life, or breath of life, imports breath that sustains life; and the whole passage just means this—Let the waters bring forth abundantly the creeping animals that live by breathing—in a word, breathing creeping animals. The same remarks are also applicable to v. 30, to "every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life" (margin, "*a living soul*"—*nephesh*), that is, *soul*, or breath of life—in a word, to every breathing animal that creepeth upon the earth, as well as to the beasts and fowls, mentioned in the beginning of the verse, the Almighty gave the green herb for meat.

It is the *oxygen* in the atmosphere that renders it vital, or life-supporting: let this element be removed, or consumed, and, as in the Black Hole at Calcutta, it becomes life-destroying.

SEC. III. *Nephesh* is translated "*creature*," or animal.

Gen. 1: 21, "And God created great whales, and every living creature" (*nephesh*). Verse 24, "Let the earth bring forth the living creature" (*nephesh*). 2: 19, "Whatsoever Adam called every living creature" (*nephesh*). 9: 10, "every living creature (*nephesh*) that is with you." Lev. 11: 46, "This is the law——of every living creature (*nephesh*) that moveth in the waters."

Then each "beast," "fowl," and "creeping" thing, is a *nephesh*, a creature; that is, an organized being living by breathing the atmospheric air. The noun *nephesh* thus clearly bears out the import of the verb *naphash* (Sec. I.): each animal is a *nephesh*, in virtue of its living *by breathing.*

This seems to be the proper place to introduce the text, Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul" (*nephesh*).

Observe 1st. Man, not *a part* of him, was made of dust, or world matter. The passage does not say his body was made of "dust;" he, the ENTIRE MAN, the being Adam, was made of dust. Hence we read, "Dust THOU"—not a part of him—"dust THOU art, and unto dust shalt THOU return." Gen. 3: 15. Compare Job 10: 9; Ps. 30: 9; 103: 14; 146: 4. Ecc. 3: 20, "All"—men and animals—"all are of the *dust* and all turn to *dust* again." The materiality of the entire man is conveyed no less pointedly in the designation "flesh" given to man, as in Gen. 6: 3, "he also is *flesh*;"—and in such language as this, "the end of all *flesh*," Gen. 6: 13;—"hath made of one *blood* all nations of men," Acts 17: 26;—and "*flesh* and *blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. 15: 50. To make these passages teach, with a view to suit the demands of a creed in theology or philosophy, that the Creator formed only a part of man of "dust," is, in our judgment, instead of trembling reverentially in handling the record, to use a liberty with it which borders on infidelity itself. The unhappy infidel rejects all the text; and such a mode of expounding it treats the sacred words as if they were imperfect and partially false.

Ob. 2d. How man became alive. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." That is, the man was made alive by being made to breathe; and, in living by breathing, he resembles all the other organized creatures or souls. "They have *all one breath*," Ecc. 3: 19: which is, therefore, the breath of lives, or the breath that supports so many different lives, or living animals. Were it necessary it could be shown at length here, that the two gases (oxygen and nitrogen), which form the atmosphere breathed by man, enter, in a solid state, into the composition of his organized textures—the brain, flesh, &c.; they are also found in the fluids. Blood has eighty

per cent. of water, and water is a compound of *oxygen* and hydrogen; blood contains nitrogen and oxygen, as well as other elements. The brain and nerves contain a large quantity of albumen, which is one of the constituents of blood; one of the "fatty acids," discovered in the brain, contains nitrogen. No vegetables afford nutriment to animals unless they are rich in *nitrogen*. (See Liebeg's Animal Chemistry, by Gregory, 3d Edition, Part I., pp. 12, 50, 52, &c.) From this it could be proven that "breath" is essentially, to a given extent, of the same nature as the animal organization; indeed, man breathes what he is made of, as disclosed by the chemical analysis of his being. Man inhales the air, his breath is nephesh, and he himself, to a great extent, is breath or air, in an organized solid, or liquid state; radically, then, he is one with the vital atmosphere—this breath, or its elements, differently received by him, (the oxygen, e. g., in one form, from the air absorbed by the blood, in its passage through the lungs,) being largely found in his physical structure.

Ob. 3rd. What man became,—literally grew into,—in the act of becoming alive. The man made of dust "*became a living soul*" (nephesh); or more accurately, even, he became *living soul*. See also 1 Cor. 15 : 45. The words here (Gen. 2 : 7) rendered "living soul" are, in the first chapter of that book, *twice* translated "*living creature*," and in the other passages quoted at the commencement of this section, where the inferior tribes are spoken of. In all these verses, for "living creature" we may read "LIVING SOUL;" and in the one before us, Gen. 2 : 7, we may, with equal propriety, render the Hebrew, man became a living (not an *ever*-living) creature, or a living being.—God breathed into man the breath of life, and *the man became alive*,—became living man, is the perfect force of the language. We may, therefore, make all the original phrases in our English version "living creature," or all "living soul;" so that to be a "living soul" is nothing peculiar to man, each of the inferior breathing tribes being a "*living soul*" as well as *himself*. They are all *souls*, inasmuch as they live by breathing; he *became* living soul—living creature; an animal alive and to live by breathing. The identity in their mode of being, as in their material constitution, is thus shown to be perfect.

SEC. IV. *Nephesh* is rendered "*life*," as

Gen. 9 : 4, "But flesh with the life (naphesh) thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." Verse 5, "At the hand of every man's brother will I require the life (nephesh) of man." Ex. 21 : 23, "Shalt give life (nephesh) for life" (nephesh). Job 2 : 4, "All that a man hath will he give for his life" (napheshu). Job 12 : 10. "In whose hand is the soul (nephesh—margin, "life") of every living thing." Job 31 : 39, "have caused the owners thereof to lose their life"—(nephesh). Prov. 12 : 10, "A righteous man regarded the life (nephesh) of his beast." Jonah 1 : 14, "Let us not perish for this man's life" (nephesh). See also Lev. 17 : 11 and 14; also 24 : 17 [margin.]

The reason why life is expressed by "nephesh" is obviously this:—life results from breathing, and as breath is "nephesh," life, its product, is also so denominated.

Here we may advantageously note a few passages where, in place of the indefinite rendering "soul," it had been better if "life" had been employed, as in the above verses and others that might have been transcribed. These are, Gen. 35 : 18, "And it came to pass as her [Rachel's] soul [naphesh] was in departing (for she died) that she called his name Ben-oni," &c. Her soul—her nephesh—undoubtedly was her life, and the parenthetic words, "for she died," show clearly that such was the sense in which the inspired historian used the term. It was not her that was departing, but her soul—her life—was departing from her, or expiring. She was ceasing to breathe, and life, like an exhausted lamp, was going out. Hence we read "she died," and she was buried. Dust she was, and unto dust she—not a part of her merely—returned; in a word, the woman Rachel died and was committed to the tomb.

Again: 1 Kings 17 : 21, 22, 23, "And he [Elijah] stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul [nephesh] come into him [margin, his inward parts] again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah, and the soul [nephesh] of the child came into him again, and he revived. And Elijah took the child, and brought him down out of the chamber into the house, and delivered him unto his mother, and Elijah said, see, thy SON LIVETH."

Had our translators rendered nephesh, in v. 21, "life," instead of soul, as they have done in many other places, of which we have already given proof, there would have been no difficulty in understanding this text. That it should have been so rendered, or that we ought here to understand by the word soul "life," is obvious from the whole circumstances of the narrative,

a. We learn from v. 17 that the child's sickness was so sore "that there was no breath left in him;" and by ceasing to breathe he would cease to live.

b. The mother understood him to be dying "art thou come unto me——to *slay* my son?" v. 18.

c. The language of Elijah after the child's recovery is most explicit, "THY SON LIVETH," v. 23; he was miraculously restored to life and activity.

d. Let it also be marked that the Prophet prayed that the soul (there is nothing about *immortal* soul in the passage) of the child might come "into him again." He did not ask that he—the child—might return, say to his body again: but that the soul might return to the child; in a word, that the boy might be made to live anew. The personality was in the child, not in his soul, which soul merely gave life to, or was the life of the enfeebled child. Life had departed, breathing had ceased, or he had ceased to live; the prophet desired that life might return, or that he might re-live, in the mercy of Heaven. We use the same form of speech ourselves; for example, we say a man's strength has gone, that it has returned; we speak of health returning and of health departing, and we mean that the man has become weak or strong; he has become diseased, or grown healthy again. So here, the child's "soul" or life went away,—he ceased to

live; it returned, or he began afresh to live by breathing, as he had done before the fatal calamity assailed him.

Another passage is Job 11 : 20, "But the eyes of the wicked shall fail, and their hope shall be as [margin, a puff of breath] the giving up of the ghost" [naphesh.]

Giving up the ghost is expiring, and thus the version is rather a commentary on the original than strictly a rendering of it. To give up the "naphesh," here rendered ghost, is giving up the life; and to expire is to cease to live, the continuance of life being dependent on the prolongation of the breathing. Hence, for a hope to be like the giving up the naphesh, is to be transient and vain.

SEC. V. The idea of personality, or self, is often expressed by "nephesh," rendered soul. Of this the instances are all but innumerable, a few examples will enable the reader to detect others in a moment.

Gen. 12 : 13, "My soul [I] shall live because of thee;" 34 : 3, "His soul clave [he clave] unto Dinah;" 42 : 21, "We saw the anguish of his soul," i. e., his anguish. Exod. 30 : 12, "Give every man a ransom for his soul [for him] unto the Lord." Ps. 3 : 2, "Which say of my soul," [of me]; 25 : 13, "His soul [he] shall dwell at ease;" 49 : 8, "The redemption of their soul" [their redemption]; 56 : 13, "Thou hast delivered my soul [me] from death;" 89 : 48, "Shall he deliver his soul [him] from the hand of the grave." Prov. 2 : 10, "Knowledge is pleasant unto thy soul," [to thee.]

Not unfrequently have our translators omitted the nephesh (rendered soul in the preceding verses) and simply expressed the force of the original, as will be seen in a few examples.

Gen. 14 : 21, "Give me the persons [margin, "souls,"] and take the goods to thyself;" 36 : 6, "And Esau took——all the persons [mar., souls,] of his house." Exod. 12 : 16, "save that which every man [mar., soul,] must eat." Lev. 4 : 27, "And if any one [margin, souls,] of the common people." Judges 16 : 30, "And Samson said, let me [mar., my soul,] die." Job 31 : 39, "caused the owners [mar., soul of the owners] thereof to lose their life,"—nephesh—[mar., expire]; 36 : 14, "They die," [mar., their soul dieth.] Ps. 105 : 18, "He [mar., his soul,] was laid in iron." Isa. 46 : 2, "but themselves [mar., their souls] are gone into captivity."

The explanation of such passages as the following, where nephesh occurs, and where it is rendered soul, is no less obvious and satisfactory.

Joshua 10 : 30, 32, 39, "He [Joshua] smote ——all the souls [i. e., all the men] that were therein," &c,; 11 : 11, "Smote all the souls," [i. e., men.] Ps. 22 : 29, "None can keep alive his own soul," [or himself]; 30 : 3, "Brought up my soul [me] from the grave;" 56 : 13, "Deliver my soul [me] from death." Isa. 38 : 17, "Thou hast in love to my soul [me] delivered it [me] from the pit of corruption." Jer. 2 : 34, "Blood of the souls," [of the men.] Ezek. 13 : 18, 19, "To slay the souls [the men, or those] that should not die; and to save the souls alive [the men, or those] that should not live," &c. : 18 : 4, "All souls [men] are mine, as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth it shall die,"—or simply thus,—all are mine, as the father is mine, so also the son is mine,—HE that sinneth shall die; 22 : 25, "They have devoured souls," [men]; verse 27, "to destroy souls," [men.]

It may be useful to call attention to one other passage, which, after the verses just quoted, cannot be found to present any insuperable difficulty to a candid mind. It is Ps. 16 : 10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Quoted in Acts 2 : 27, 31.

a. What is here rendered hell, is sheol in the Hebrew, which, according to Professor Lee, means a grave; the state of the dead, or a state of death; the grave; any great depth. It is rendered grave in Ecc. 9 : 10, "There is no work——in the grave [sheol] whither THOU goest," So also in Ps. 30 : 3; 31 : 17; 88 : 3; 89 : 48; Prov. 1 : 12; Hos. 13 : 14.

b. "My soul" is a Hebrewism for *me*, as we have discovered in many other passages, and the words *my soul* are here obviously parallelled, and indeed explained by the phrase "thine Holy One" in the end of the passage.

c. The soul of Messiah, was Messiah himself; and the soul of Messiah, Jehovah's Holy One, could see corruption in the grave; but this is a prediction that he would not be permitted to see corruption. In other words, the text is announcement that Messiah should have a very early resurrection; and that this was the fact the gospel history explicitly attests.

Having presented these passages, we may remark, in concluding this section, that the process by which nephesh came to designate a man, appears to have been the following:—It first means breath, then life, resulting from the inhalation of vital air by the lungs; and then, naturally, the being who breathes and so lives. By being described as a nephesh, man is portrayed to us as an organized being who is to live by breathing, like the other breathing creatures, or souls, who are subjected to the same life-laws with ourselves.

SEC. VI. Nephesh is applied to dead men; or it designates a corpse. Man *became* a living soul by being made to breathe, and, when he expires at the final hour, he becomes a soul without life, or a dead soul,—a dead being. The following are instances of this usage:

Num. 6 : 6, "He shall come at no dead body," (nephesh] or dead man : 9 : 6, "certain men who were defiled by the dead body [nephesh] of a man." Lev. 19 : 28, "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead," [nephesh] : 22 : 4, "unclean by the dead," [nephesh]; Hag. 2 : 13, "unclean by a dead body," [nephesh.]

SEC. VII. Nephesh describes some of the powers, desires, appetites, or mental states of a man; or of a living human soul.

Gen. 23 : 8, "If it be your mind,"—nephesh-echem, your opinion, your judgment. Exod. 15 : 9, "My lust [naphesh] shall be satisfied upon them,"—I will be revenged upon them. Deut. 6 : 5, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul [naphesh] and with all thy might."

What special power of man is expressed by *soul*, in this passage, is not easily discovered. If heart is taken to express *affection*, soul may then be understood to describe *intellect*, or mind; perhaps it may be *life* that is referred to, and it is as easy to suppose a call to love God with all the *life* as with all the "might." Obviously the text summons men to love supremely the Eternal God of love and mercy, with every power they possess, and as long as they have them for exercise, let the capacities receive from us whatever names we please to confer on them.

Deut. 23: 24, "at thine own pleasure,"—naphesheka; 28: 65, "The Lord shall give thee sorrow of mind,"—naphesh; simply, the Lord shall give thee sorrow. Judges 18: 25, "angry fellows,"—nephesh; margin, bitter in soul; i. e., men in a rage. 1 Sam. 22: 2, "Every one that was discontented,"—Hebrew, *man*, nephesh; margin, bitter of soul. Prov. 23: 2, "a man given to appetite,"—nephesh.

SEC. VIII. Nephesh, in conjunction with another word, is rendered tablets in Isa. 3: 20, "the head-bands and the tablets," (batei, nephesh), mar. "houses of the soul." In professor Lee's Lexicon, this Hebrew phrase is interpreted, perfume boxes. Gesenius explains it to mean, "smelling bottles." Prof. Alexander, of America, in his commentary on this verse, says, "the houses (i. e., places, or receptacles) of breath, meaning, probably; the perfume boxes, or smelling bottles worn by the Oriental women at their girdles." If perfume bottles or boxes are referred to in the text, the perfume may naturally be called their nephesh, inasmuch as it breathes out, like odors from flowers. In this way the original idea conveyed by nephesh, breath, (see preceding Sec. II,) is beautifully preserved. The soul of the perfume boxes was the perfume that exhaled from them.

THE CROSS,—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

The intelligent writer, whose "serial papers on the doctrine of the Cross" I am humbly endeavoring to test by the Word which abideth forever, referring to "a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. 12), observes: "The Cross is characterised as a great ignomy or 'Shame;' and is called the 'contradiction' (or opposition) of sinners against Christ. It is there simply regarded as the expression of sinful resistance to Christ's character and mission. No other aspect of the Cross is here recognised by the sacred writer; and this particular aspect is so presented as to necessitate the conclusion that the cross of the Lord Jesus was, in its character and value, not expiatory but exemplary." He also remarks, "that as both James and John endured violent deaths as witnesses to the truth,—the moral character of Christ's death was the same,—that he suffered and died as a witness of the truth. It was in each case a martyrdom."

Our author's views, on this important subject, are here exhibited without the shade of ambiguity. The death of the Son of God, in respect to its "moral character" and expiatory nature, is reduced to a level with the deaths of James and John! God no more made the "soul" or life of his "only begotten Son" "an offering FOR SIN" (Isa. 53) than he made the lives of James and John such an offering. The Lamb of God, *by dying for us*, no more "taketh away the sins of the world," than James and John! "The Jehovah hath (no more) laid on (Jesus) the iniquity of us all" than he has laid it on James and John, or Cranmer and Ridley, or any other martyr. One was no more "wounded FOR our transgressions," or "bruised FOR our iniquities" than the other: (Isa. 53). "We were (no more) reconciled to God by the death of his Son," are no more justified by HIS blood," than we are reconciled and justified by the death and blood of any other martyr:—Rom. 5: 10. God has no more "set forth" his matchless Son "to be a propitiation (mercy seat) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins," than he has set forth James and John, or John Rogers, for that grand and gracious purpose of infinite wisdom and love! Rom. 3: 25. The former was no more "delivered FOR our offences" than the other:—Rom. 4: 25. What then meaneth the testimony of the inspired Apostle: "These are they which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes and made them white IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB?"—Rev. 7: 14. What are the arguments offered to sustain a theory manifestly opposed to the obvious import of these divine testimonies? Is it possible that so talented a writer can imagine that his proving that our blessed Lord died as a martyr, or witness to truth, is proving that he died *only* as a martyr? Is proving that his death is to be viewed in this aspect, proving that it is to be viewed *in no other*? Our author has referred to Heb. 12th chap., where the apostle, exhorting to the exercise of christian patience, enforces the duty by the example of Jesus, who "endured the cross," and the "contradiction of sinners against himself." It is true, indeed, as the writer affirms, that the inspired apostle regarded the crucifixion "as the expression of sinful resistance to Christ's character and mission." Is this proving that he regarded it in "no other aspect?" Why, then, I ask, did he in the very same Epistle write as follows;

"For such a High Priest became us, who is holy—who needeth not daily, as those high priests [under the Law] to offer up sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once, when he offered up himself:"—7: 26, 27.

"For if the blood of bulls and of goats—sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that *by means of death*, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance:"— 9: 13, 15. "Christ was once offered to *bear the sins* of many." "Now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Without the shedding of blood is no remission:"—9: 26, 28, 22. "We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once:"—

10 : 10. "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sin," &c., 12th verse.

What are the aspects here represented by the inspired apostle, in which he contemplated the death of the Son of God? It is as *an offering* or "sacrifice for sin." "He offered up himself" as "MEANS—for the redemption of transgression" and of our receiving "the promise of eternal inheritance." It was to "BEAR the sins of many."

It is argued that, because Jesus told his disciples, "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized," his "suffering and death—were *not* of the nature of an expiation," &c. It is affirmed that "the cup and baptism (of the Savior and his disciples) were in *kind* the same;" "their experience would be *identical* with his own." The question is, were they the same *in all respects?* Was the divine purpose the same in respect to design? "The Lord hath laid on Him [His Son] the iniquities of us all:"—Isa. 53 : 6. Did he thus lay our iniquities *on "James and John?"* Was "the chastisement of our peace *upon" them?* v. 5.

Our intelligent author must, I think, on a review of the subject, perceive that his construction of the Savior's words is untenable. There is no logical necessity for any other construction than that his disciples should endure sufferings and death for the sake of the *same holy truth* for which *he* suffered. The Savior's words contain no implication that "the principle of his final sufferings was not unique" in any particular. In suffering for Christ's truth, they had "fellowship with his sufferings," although it can never be said of their sufferings and death that they were "a propitiation—for the sins of the whole world:"—1 John 2 : 2. "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified:"—Heb. 10 : 14. Will our respected author affirm this of all or any of his disciples? He *must* affirm it, or acknowledge that "the principle of his final sufferings *was* unique." No other martyr must presume to claim any participation of this honor with the matchless Son of the Blessed. None other in heaven or on earth, or under the earth, can ever announce that he "has washed us from our sins in His own blood:"—Rev. 1 : 4.

"O the sweet wonders of the Cross
Where Christ the Savior loved and died!"

Our author remarks of the Cross, "Although foreseen by God, it was not demanded and planned by Him." See Acts 2 : 23; 4 : 27, 28.

We thank the writer for reminding us of the solemn caution of the inspired apostle, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy—after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." The question is, what, in respect to the subject at issue, is the "philosophy" which is "after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world," and what is the divine philosophy which is "after Christ?" Our appeal now is to Christ himself, "the faithful Witness" of the Truth, to determine this important question. Let us obey the voice of Jehovah, "Hear ye him."

"I lay down my life FOR my sheep." "I lay it down of myself." "The Son of man came to *give his life a ransom* for many." "The bread that I will give is my flesh which I will give FOR the life of the world." "This is my blood which is shed for many FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS." Compare Isa. 53 : 5, 6, 10.

What is the philosophy which is "after the tradition of men," &c.? It is that this "doctrine of the Cross," this emanation of the wisdom and love of God, is "to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness." "The [animal] man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned:"—1 Cor. 2 : 14. The apostle, inspired by the Eternal Spirit, and our author are agreed on this point. The holy truth, to the natural or animal man, is indeed "absurd and offensive." I pray our Father that there may be also an agreement in opposing "the wisdom" which "is foolishness with God." Did he cause "the offense of the Cross" to cease, by compromising the matter with carnal men, whose "understanding and moral sentiments" were "violently shocked" with this "stumbling block?" Did he attempt to remodel the "sure corner stone" because the builders rejected it? Did he give place by subjection to the self-righteous Jew or conceited Greek, through fear of giving "plausibility to infidelity?" "*No, not for an hour.*"

It is asked, "can crime be cleansed by crime?" To this and all questions of the same category, it is sufficient to reply in the language of inspiration, "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee." As Joseph said to his penitent brethren, so can Jesus say to his penitent crucifiers, "Ye thought EVIL against me; but God meant it unto GOOD, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people alive:"—Gen. 50 : 20.

To divest the offering of the Son of God of its *vicarious* character, is to divest the entire divine institution of typical sacrifices of all significance, and to subvert the foundation of the hope of eternal life, by nullifying the means which infinite wisdom has devised, that God may "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

"Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood*, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS AN EXAMPLE.—BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Continued from page 117.]

No attentive reader of the Pauline Epistles can fail to observe that the cross was associated in the Apostle's mind with ideas very foreign to the notion of expiation. Already we have seen how he aspired after a common experience with Christ in his crucial sufferings and death, and it is in harmony with that aspiration, and the language in which he expresses it, that he speaks of being "crucified *with* Christ." There is no difficulty in apprehending the Apostle's meaning in this and similar modes of speech, if we suppose him to have conceived of the cross as neither more nor less than the malignant and wicked recompense of that high devotion to truth and righteousness which Christ came to reveal and fulfil. But if we are to associ-

ate with the cross a scheme of judicial satisfaction by substitutionary punishment, then a singularly alien idea is introduced, and one which refuses to concur not only, as we have seen, with its several historic incidents, but with those forms of expression, and associations of thought, which so frequently present themselves in the apostolical writings. If the cross of Christ was an expiatory fact, as it is commonly understood by the popular mind, then we are at a loss to account for that style of speech, so familiar to the Apostles, which obviously establishes a oneness of experience with their Lord in this special incident of his history. Again we repeat, the cross of Christ, if expiatory, would have stood forth in its own solitary singularity unapproached and unapproachable, as much as, nay, more so than Sinai, when it was made a tabernacle for the terrible manifestation of the Divine Majesty. The experience of Christ *then* could never have been made a grand lesson of human virtue, and be held forth for the imitation of mankind, as it evidently is in the epistolary writings. Nor could the Apostles have had such a conception of the cross as that which they reveal when they speak of *fellowship in Christ's sufferings*, and *conformity to his death*, and being *crucified with Christ*. They draw too near, and claim too great intimacy when they so speak of the world's expiation.—Their more suitable attitude would be to stand far off, and smite upon their breasts, and gaze with unmingled awe. But they obviously approach with bold step and speech, and, instead of looking upon the cross as a solitary and terrible insulation,—as the awful concentration of judicial ideas hedged about by the most singularly distinct circumstances—they stand with shod feet on this great central spot,—surround themselves with the identical circumstances, and regard it as the very soul of their religious life. Thus speaks one of the Apostolical College: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by which* the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." Strange language on the expiation theory! The *cross*, and *that* top of the Lord Jesus Christ, is here in a figure made to bear another victim, and that "*the world*,"—the spirit, principles, and pursuits of the world,—"by which *the world is crucified* unto me." And to establish the completeness of the divorce between himself and the world, he represents the cross of Christ as bearing yet another victim, and that himself—"and *I* (am crucified) unto the world." We think we have very strong presumption against the expiatory notion of the cross in such apostolical phraseology. If the Apostle wished to convey the idea that the world was *dead* to him, and he *dead* to the world, he could have said so, without introducing the idea of the *cross* and *crucifixion*, which, on the popular supposition, is the symbol of ideas so entirely unique as to be unfit for illustrating such, or indeed any subject, and which we should imagine, on this supposition, would never have been associated in the mind of an Apostle with any other idea than than that one insulated idea, which it is alleged especially to imply. But the fact is manifestly otherwise. The cross has entered largely into the vocabulary of apostolical theology, and furnished one of the commonest illustrations of the New Testament. Its exclusive appropriation to Christ, which the popular theory requires, is at once confronted by such a passage as that we have just quoted, where we find that the cross, not *a* cross, but *the* cross of Christ is made the common property of Apostles, and even of the world by personification. Paul speaks of being "crucified with Christ,"—of being crucified to the world *by the cross* of Christ, and of the *world* being crucified to him, *by the cross* of Christ. Even "the flesh, with the *affections* and *lusts*," are said to be "crucified." And in another place Paul says, "our old man is crucified with him," not, be it observed, he was crucified *for* our "old man," or former corrupt self, but our corrupt self, or old man, is crucified on his cross, and with him. Such a rhetorical appropriation of the cross of Christ we do not understand on the theory of expiation, but find no difficulty in understanding it apart from that theory. The phraseology, technical though it be, affirms the intelligible truth that all true christians have undergone such a moral transformation as is implied in the change of the old or former man, into the new man; and that this great transformation has been accomplished on the same principle of personal resistance of sin, which ultimately ended, in the case of Christ, in his crucifixion. It is manifestly in reference to believers' personal reformation that the Apostle says, "Our old man is crucified with him," for he adds, "that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." But why should Paul describe this personal reformation of a believer's character, by the idea of *crucifying* the old man, or old corrupt nature, unless he understood the cross to express the great moral idea of holiness resisting and overcoming the assaults of sin? This was beyond doubt the idea in Paul's mind, an idea totally distinct from, and inconsistent with the expiatory and vicarious nature of the cross of Christ.

The same Apostle has a remark in his Epistle to the Galatians too obviously bearing on this part of our subject to be passed by without notice. The work of Paul in Galatia had been greatly interrupted by the blind fanaticism of certain Judaizing teachers, who insisted on the obligation of circumcision, and the maintenance of the Mosaic institutes, by the Christian disciples. The pain and annoyance which this circumstance had given the Apostle, are apparent throughout his Epistle to that Church; and it is in reference thereto that, in the close of his letter, he says, "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Here is plainly an allusion to the crucial *stigmata*, or scars on the person of Jesus, which he had received in his unswerving fidelity to truth and righteousness. These marks were flesh witnesses to the perfection of that obedience from which even a violent death could not divert him. They stood, therefore, in the natural rhetoric of the Apostle as the symbols of an unflinching devotion

* Gal. 6 : 14—The English version has "by *whom*," which is obviously not the sense, nor the grammatical rendering. The margin has "*whereby*," "*by which*," that is, by *the cross*.

under persecution; and because he himself had flesh scars, endured in the same great cause, he says, with peculiar propriety, "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." The thrice scourging, and the stoning at Lystra, had left their indelible tokens on his person, which he gloried in as the tokens of a truer circumcision than that supplied by the mere ceremonial circumcision which certain of the Galatian Church were anxious to superadd to their Christian faith. Now this comparison of the scars or marks in his own flesh with those which had been left in the flesh of Christ by the crucifixion, establishes a common principle in their endurance; it explains Paul's idea that Christ was crucified on the very same principle as he was scourged and stoned, that is, in bearing a living testimony to the truth of God. Had the Apostle regarded the cross-scars of Christ as the tokens of a vicarious satisfaction or expiation, he surely could not have expressed himself as he does in the language above. That he should have placed his own scars and those of the Lord Jesus Christ in juxtaposition, and even call Christ's mark his own, is another and very considerable weight in the scale of evidence against the popular theory of expiation. This language takes its place side by side with that which has already come under our notice, where Paul aspires after "the fellowship of Christ's suffering," and to be made conformable to his death;" it expresses the Apostle's idea, as Mr. Albert Barnes has well put it, that it was his duty as it was his privilege, to become in all things "just like Christ."

Peter, (first Epist. 2 : 19–21), like his brother Apostle, alludes to the sufferings of Christ in a manner which is totally inexplicable on the popular theory. He tells servants that they should be subject not only to such masters as are "good and gentle, but also to the froward: for this is thankworthy," he adds, "if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if when ye be buffeted for your faults ye shall take it patiently? But if when ye *do well*, and *suffer for it*, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto, (namely, to suffer for well doing, and so to suffer wrongfully,) were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us (that is, suffered wrongfully, contrary to all justice, because he was a well-doer), leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps." What can be plainer than that Peter says Christ suffered for us, by way of an example, *not* for the expiation of our sins? He bids us follow his steps in the matter of his sufferings, because hereunto are we called. Then clearly the sufferings of Christ are exemplary, and as such cannot be of the nature of an expiation.

In the chapter following the above quotation the same Apostle says, "For it is better if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins,"—not as a punishment for sins, or for the sake of expiating sins, because why should the Apostle introduce such an idea in this place, where he is enjoining his disciples to suffer, if need be, for well-doing, rather than for evil-doing, and also introduces it with the word *for*, which signifies the introduction of an *example* or a *motive*? He could only mean that "Christ also hath once suffered for sins," in the sense of suffering unjustly as a well-doer, hence he adds, "the *just* for the unjust," and hence the appropriateness of this reference to Christ's sufferings, and their value as an example to suffer for well doing.

The exemplary character of Christ's sufferings are yet further set forth in the opening verse of the succeeding chapter (chap. 4 : 1), "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind." Here believers are enjoined to be prepared to imitate Christ's sufferings, if the occasion shall demand it, and in the view of such an occasion he writes, "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange happened unto you, but rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings."

No one, we presume, will venture to deny that the Scriptures set forth the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ in the light of an EXAMPLE to the Church. We have never heard this disputed. As a doctrine it is acknowledged, but it is not prominently set forth and enforced. And the reason is obvious. It is not easy to reconcile the *exemplary* and *expiatory* character of the cross of Christ. If it be *expiatory*, how can it be *imitated*? and yet, if it be *exemplary*, it must be *capable of imitation*. Can the cross of Christ have this two-fold character? That it is exemplary the Scriptures distinctly declare—but they do not distinctly declare that it is expiatory. We must, if we acknowledge the authority of Scripture, accept the first, but we are not bound to accept the latter, for the reason that it is nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures. There is express Scripture authority in support of the doctrine that the cross of Christ is the Church's example, but there is *not* express Scripture authority that it is the Church's expiation. This latter is only a theological speculation, and ought a theological speculation to be elevated to the rank of a Scripture doctrine, especially where it is found to be at irreconcilable variance with another clearly ascertained and undisputed truth? We lay great stress on this part of the argument against the popular doctrine of expiation, and do not hesitate to declare our conviction that, confronted with the fact that the cross of Christ is erected before the Church as its great EXAMPLE—the notion of expiation is untenable, and ought to be repudiated. Add to this the whole force of evidence derived from the Scripture history of the Crucifixion, and our Lord's public and private discourses concerning that event, and the conclusion is logically inevitable, that the idea of an expiation is most foreign to the nature and purpose of Christ's death, and cannot be made to consist with the facts and phenomena of the case.

AFFLICTIONS—Those afflictions which have their proper effect on us and humble us into true resignation, are like storms which drive rightly-directed vessels towards their desired ports.

The longer the saw of contention is drawn the hotter it grows.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MAY 1, 1854.

THE CONFLICT.

REVIEW OF PROF. MATTISON.—BY THE EDITOR.

In our last, we brought our review of Prof. Mattison's first discourse to a close. We now proceed with his second. His text was Luke 23 : 43, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." He remarked :

"We shall prove, this evening, from the Word of God, that immediately at death, the soul of the righteous goes to glory. Nature throughout recognizes the distinction between mind and matter. Death is the separation of the two."

If "nature recognizes the distinction between mind and matter," will the Professor be kind enough to show us where in nature a *created* mind is recognized as existing, or making any manifestations, *separate* from matter? If death is the separation of mind and matter, will he show us where in nature there is evidence of the existence and activity of that mind when thus separated? Can he do it without going to the "Spirit Rappers?" But the Prosessor is strong against them; yet they manifestly are too strong for him: for he gives them their premises: *i. e.*, he admits that mind lives and acts when *the man* is dead! But as the Professor does not claim this spirit rapping development, in his facts in "nature," we are curious to know if he has any others. Let him prove, if he can, that a created mind can live and act separate from all material organisation, or separate from matter. But he saith :

"If this [text] was the only declaration in the Bible, on this point, it ought forever to set the question at rest. Those who teach the death of the spirit with the body, when they come to this text are like Samson, shorn of their strength. They know not at what point to raise a fog to obscure its meaning. The Savior told the thief, in substance, this day thy soul shall be with my soul in paradise, that is, in heaven."

Here is a little "fog," but we think we can see through it. In the first place, it is obvious the Prof. makes "mind—soul—and spirit," synonymous terms; hence, the spirit and soul are the mind, and the mind is the spirit or soul. The spirit, soul, and mind, are only so many different words for thought. Then if the Savior's promise to the thief was, "in substance, this day *thy soul* shall be in heaven," it stands thus: "This day thy thought shall be with my thought in heaven;" or "Thy mind shall be with my mind in heaven." But waiving this: by what authority does the Professor give us the "substance" of the Savior's words? The words themselves are, "This day shalt THOU"—the *person* addressed, "be with *me*"—the *person* who speaks—"in paradise." Three days after, and subsequent to his resurrection, Jesus said to Mary, John 20 : 17, "Touch *me* not; for *I* am not yet ascended to my father." Hence three days are passed and Jesus had not been to heaven "*yet*;" therefore the Professor's inference from the Savior's words cannot be true, and that part of *his* "fog" is dissipated. Jesus' own testimony that he had *not* "*yet* ascended" to heaven, cannot be set aside to accommodate our friend; and any attempt to set it aside—as some do—by saying, "He had not ascended in his *body*, but his *soul* had been there," is null and void, from the fact that Jesus declares that he, *personally*, had "not *yet* ascended,"—*I*—the personality—the Jesus who spoke to the thief and said, "with *me*." The personality is the same in each case—the one before and the other after his resurrection.

There is no difficulty in the text under consideration only what arises from neither of the other evangelists having said anything of the penitence of one of the thieves, and two of them having expressly said that the thieves—plural—reviled Christ upon the cross. Supposing the account of Luke to be a genuine account of the penitence of one malefactor, it is only necessary to understand the thief's prayer to remove all the "fog." What did the thief pray for? "Lord remember *me* when thou comest *into* thy kingdom." Archbishop Whately says, "*Into* is a mis-translation; it should be, *in* thy kindom. The meaning is—at thy second coming in triumphant glory. Thus we read in Heb. 9 : 28, 'Christ was once offered, &c. . . : and unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time . . . . . unto salvation.'"—*Scrip. Rev. on a Future State*, p. 324.

Thus, then, the thief prayed that when Jesus—who was now being "offered" on the cross—should come in his glory, to take his kingdom, that he would remember him. The answer is plain—"This day"—of which the thief had spoken, viz., when Christ should come *in* his kingdom, at his return "*from* heaven" in his glory—"thou"—not thy soul merely—but "*thou* shalt be with me in paradise." Here all is plain and easy to be understood, and the "fog" is all on the Professor's side; for if he insists on the literal day in which the words were spoken he has not only the insurmountable testimony of Christ to overcome, that he had not *yet* ascended to heaven three days after, but he has also to prove that the thief died that day at all. He was not dead when "the even" of that day came; for it was after that his legs were broken to hasten his death; and hence unless his soul

left his body before he was dead, it did not arrive at paradise till the day after the promise; and if it arrived there then, the promise was unfulfilled in two particulars: 1st. It was not the "to-day" of the Professor; and, 2nd, Jesus was not there for more than forty days afterwards. Let the impartial now judge on which side the fog is. It is all light on our side, in our judgment. Whether our Professor is in the fog, he perhaps can judge better than we. Wishing him a happy deliverance from all fog, we pass this part of the subject. The Professor goes on to say:

"Paul says, 'death cannot separate us from God,' therefore the soul lives on, or death does separate us from Him."

If the Professor had told us where Paul says this we would have felt obliged to him. It is however nowhere in the Bible, and must be a new revelation, if the Professor is correct in the statement. We have no doubt he thought Paul said so, yet he should translate the English right, if we cannot do so with Hebrew and Greek, as he affirmed not one of us could. The mistake of our Professor here is in making a very important omission. Paul saith, Rom. 8: 35–39, that nothing "shall be able to separate us from *the love* of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." Let it be observed it is the love of God, as manifested in Christ Jesus, that neither death nor anything else can separate us from. When the saint falls asleep in death he is no more separated from the *love* of God than the infant asleep in its mother's arms, or in the cradle before her, is separated from the love of its mother. Her love, if possible, is even stronger than before, while she watches for it to awake; especially if it was suffering much before it fell asleep, and she knew it was to awake free from all pain and sorrow. God's children are great sufferers here, especially those of whom the Apostle is speaking in this chapter—they were killed all the day long, &c. v. 36; but though killed God *loves* them still, and watches over them to awake them at the last trump, by the voice of His Son, in whose hands he has placed their lives; and because of their union with His Son he loves them though men may hate and kill them. That love secures their resurrection at the last day; from *it* they cannot be separated, not even in death. But what has this to do with the Professor's assumption from his imperfect quotation? Next he says:

"God is not the God of the dead but of the living, therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must be living, or God is not their God."

Here is another specimen of a want of attention to the text and its connection. What is the subject in dispute, of which these words are an imperfect extract? It is the subject of the Resurrection. It was not about the present state of the dead, though it involved the agreement of both parties that the dead were not now alive. We say it involved this agreement, because no question of their present state was raised, it was a question about the *resurrection*. The Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, and believed that death was an eternal cessation of conscious existence: that was what they called being *dead*. Hence their question is direct on this subject—"Whose wife of them (the seven husbands) is she *in the resurrection?*" Not, Whose wife is she now? Mark's record reads the question thus, "In the resurrection therefore, *when they rise*, whose wife shall she be of them?" And Jesus' recorded answer, in Mark is, "When they shall rise from the dead; . . . . . and as touching *the dead* that they *rise*"—not that they are now living—but, "that they rise, have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" Luke adds, "For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live unto him." Thus by a combination of the Evangelists, we arrive at this truth,—The Sadducees did not question our Lord on the present state of the dead, because they manifestly had no dispute with him as to the fact that if there is a future life, at all, it depends on a resurrection. They understood him to teach a future life to dead men by a resurrection, and in that way only; while they maintained, when men die they remain eternally dead. It is in view of their belief, or disbelief, our Lord uses the term *dead*. If men were to be eternally dead, as the Sadducees maintained, then God could not be called their God, for he is not the God of men who are dead in that sense. The Sadducees acknowledged the authority of Moses, and Jesus appeals to that authority to prove them in error. To do this, he shows them, if there be no resurrection, then Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob would be dead in their sense; but that such is not the case, he tells them that God had declared himself to be their God; hence they must have a resurrection, and that such was the purpose of God concerning those Patriarchs; in his purpose they all—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—live unto him "who quickeneth the dead and calleth those things which be not as though they were," because of the certainty of their actually being. Compare Mark 12: 23–27, and Luke 20: 27–38, with Rom. 4: 17; then turn to Heb. 11: 13, where, speaking of Abraham and others, Paul saith, "These all died in faith,

not having received the promises," &c,, and at verses 39 and 40, having spoken of many ancient worthies, he saith, "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." The whole family of saints are to be brought into the inheritance at once, at the last trump, by the resurrection, and not by a survival in life when dead.

If Prof. Mattison's construction of the words under consideration is the true one, he will find it difficult to show why the Sadducees were *silenced*. For if Jesus designed to show that the souls of those ancient Patriarchs were now living, by his appeal to Moses, his opponents might easily have replied, "How does that prove the *resurrection*, Master?" So far, in fact, would such an argument be from proving the resurrection—the very point in question—it would prove it wholly *unnecessary*, and hence highly improbable. The only way to avoid this would be to take the ground of Rev. John Howard Hinton, England, who attempts to make it appear that it is not the resurrection proper that is the disputed point, but a future life in general; but to his view Mark's account—which we have quoted—is fatal, viz.: "When they shall rise—when they shall rise from the dead"—not, when they die, or when they enter the future life merely; no, the great question of a future life all turns on the fact whether men shall rise from the dead: without such rising there is no future life to any man. The text we have considered, so far from sustaining our opponents, is an engine that demolishes their own theory completely, and is a strong bulwark to defend the position we advocate, viz., "Life—future, eternal life—only through Christ, and that by the resurrection *at the last day*." Our Professor next saith:

"'Fear not them which can kill the body but cannot kill the soul.' Man cannot kill the soul. But if it is one with the body, any man can kill it. There is no such thing in the universe as a dead soul."

Ignorant as the Professor says we are of Hebrew and Greek, we think we know enough to comprehend the fact that he does not possess the attribute of omniscience, and therefore there may be such a thing somewhere in the universe as a dead soul. If he will turn to Rev. 16: 3, he will find testimony that "every living *soul* in the sea *died*." Then there must have been such a thing as a dead soul. Should the Professor say, "That means the fishes and whales died," we reply that they were *souls*, and they *died*. If he understands Hebrew and Greek, he knows that the principal word in Hebrew for soul is *Nephesh*, and that the only word in Greek for soul is *Psuche*. In the Hebrew we find the expression *dead nephesh—dead soul*,—of not unfrequent occurrence, though our translation does not always suffer that fact to appear, but a Professor should not attempt to conceal it. The Greek term *psuche* is primarily and properly expressive of *life*, though our translators have sometimes rendered it life, and at other times soul. Of this Dr. Clarke complains, particularly in Math. 16: 25, 26. If our Professor maintains a *nephesh* or *psuche* cannot be killed by man, yet he must admit that God is *able* to destroy both soul (*psuche*) and body; for so the remainder of the text declares, from which he quoted partially. Besides, if souls cannot be killed by men, in some sense, will our friend tell us how we are to understand the record, Joshua 10th chap., where, in the overthrow of certain cities, it is said six times, with slight variations, "All the *souls* that were therein he *utterly* destroyed?" That looks as if men might kill some souls! Will the Professor say, That means he destroyed their *persons*. Agreed. So soul sometimes means *person*, or *personality*. Now whose person, or personality, cannot men kill, or destroy? Or, of whose persons or personality did Jesus speak in the text under consideration? Was it the soul or person of all men, or of a certain specific class of men? Luke introduces the words thus, "I say unto you, *my friends*;" and Matthew shows that it was in a discourse with the disciples, and to fortify them against apostacy under their coming suffering that Jesus spake the words under consideration. They express a fact, *viz.*: That *man* cannot extinguish their *personality*, or deprive his followers of life, so as to destroy or deprive them of that future and eternal life which he promised; but that God was able to do both—therefore fear not them who kill the body [deprive you of life now] but are not able to kill the soul (or extinguish your personality); for whosoever shall lose his life—*psuche*—for my sake shall find it." Compare Matth. 10: 28, and Luke 12: 4, 5, with Matth. 16: 25.

The text, then, gives no countenance to the Professor's assumption of an *entity* in man, called the soul, that survives in a state of conscionsness when the *man* is dead; but it does give the glorious hope to the followers of Christ, that however they may be tortured by men, even unto death, their personality shall be maintained by God, and they shall be raised up to an endless life at the last day. But it is also a warning that if they deny Christ, and apostatise under their sufferings, God will do

that which man cannot do—
body—extinguish their beii
forever: therefore fear Hi
have no such power.

DEFENCE OF

We here give our reader
es in the Hartford Bible Co
ever by the one we publish
"Theological Hell," which
—Ed. Ex.

It may be proper for me
that I do not stand here, ar
at any part of this discussi
word in the Bible was give
such ground have I taken.
a record, by faithful and tr
revelations that have been
and of transactions connec
tions, and that the record
not a matter of inspiration.
corded it, recorded it in th
cording to their understa
in regard to the general cha
this discussion, called for t
Bible was to be judged, an
related to my friend Wrig
settled that natural religi
ture, or the God of Nature,
the Bible was to be trie
have pressed that point fu
at that point, and to mee
ground—his own ground—
the Bible by the God of
ing the God of the Bible s
ful things which he (friend
which may be a question
comparing the God of Nat
the Bible, shown, at any ra
Bible is no worse than the
therefore the God of the Bi
in guilty under the law b
tried. If it is pleaded that
sometimes acted one way an
we say that the God of Na
same way. The God of Na
rain, waters the earth, refre
showers, and causes it to veg
and at other times the God
the rain, and the earth parc
beast suffer and languish for
saries of life. Then the Goc
ly as deficient in this respe

that which man cannot do—destroy both soul and body—extinguish their being, their personality—forever: therefore fear Him, and not men who have no such power.

DEFENCE OF THE BIBLE.

We here give our readers the last of our speeches in the Hartford Bible Convention followed however by the one we published March 15th, on the "Theological Hell," which was the last in order. —Ed. Ex.

It may be proper for me to state at the outset, that I do not stand here, and have not stood here at any part of this discussion, to plead that every word in the Bible was given by inspiration. No such ground have I taken. I take the Bible to be a record, by faithful and trustworthy witnesses, of revelations that have been made by God to men, and of transactions connected with these revelations, and that the record of these transactions is not a matter of inspiration. The persons who recorded it, recorded it in their own language, according to their understanding of it. Now, sir, in regard to the general charge, I, at the outset of this discussion, called for the law by which the Bible was to be judged, and so far at least as it related to my friend Wright and myself, it was settled that natural religion, the religion of Nature, or the God of Nature, was the law by which the Bible was to be tried. Though we might have pressed that point further, we chose to stop at that point, and to meet our friend on that ground—his own ground—and to test the God of the Bible by the God of Nature. Even supposing the God of the Bible sanctioned those dreadful things which he (friend Wright) spoke of—which may be a question of itself—we have, in comparing the God of Nature with the God of the Bible, shown, at any rate, that the God of the Bible is no worse than the God of Nature, and therefore the God of the Bible can not be brought in guilty under the law by which he was to be tried. If it is pleaded that the God of the Bible sometimes acted one way and sometimes another, we say that the God of Nature has acted in the same way. The God of Nature sometimes gives rain, waters the earth, refreshes it with cheering showers, and causes it to vegetate and bring forth; and at other times the God of Nature withholds the rain, and the earth parches up, and man and beast suffer and languish for the lack of the necessaries of life. Then the God of Nature is equally as deficient in this respect as the God of the Bible, and is equally charged with acting two separate ways at different times.

We might enlarge upon that contrast, but lest we should be charged with traveling over the ground again, we do not enlarge upon it. It has been insinuated, and something more than insinuated, that God—I supppose, of course, meaning the God of the Bible—had no right to take away man's life, except to transform him, as the caterpillar is transformed into a butterfly. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard of that caterpillar transformation till to me it is worn threadbare. Sir, the caterpillar never did die, the life never was *extinct;* enter into that caterpillar's bed, where he has wound himself for repose; put into that bed something that extinguishes life, and see if a butterfly will ever come out. *Never.* But, sir, our friend should have followed the butterfly a little further, and then the beautiful butterfly, after fluttering in the sun, and from flower to flower, *dies;* and where is it now? Look at it lying in the street! where is he? emerged into some higher life! If it has emerged into some higher life, the God of Nature has failed to reveal it. Yes, sir, and the God of Nature has failed to reveal that a son or daughter of the human family emerges into a higher life when once they die. We call upon you to bring a revelation of Nature that when a man dies he emerges into a higher state. Let us see the testimony, if they have it. Let it be forthcoming. The pagan philosophers, about whom so much has been said, only speculated upon the subject. They never satisfied even their own minds, by their own confessions, only while they were in argument. They thought it expedient to teach the doctrine to the vulgar multitude, because they could hold an influence over them by it, while they themselves did not believe in this immortality; and Bishop Whately has abundantly shown this in his work on the "Future States."

Why, sir, if the God of Nature has revealed the certainty that man lives after he is dead, I ask why it is that these recent developments, which are called "rapping spirits," have made their appearance? Is that the God of Nature, sir,? This very resort to rapping spirits is an acknowledgement that the God of Nature reveals nothing in regard to man's future life.

I shall now proceed to notice some few of the criticisms which have been made upon the Bible, or the teachings of the Bible, and which have been urged upon the attention with great pathos, as showing that the Bible was as bad as the resolution says. Perhaps I may as well begin in rela-

tion to the attempt to prove from this Bible that the God of Nature has revealed the moral perfections of God. I have taken the ground that nature or natural religion goes no further in regard to the doctrines of God than that there is a God, or that there are Gods, one or many, possessed of great power and intelligence; that the God of Nature does not reveal with any certainty to man's mind the moral perfections or character of that being or of those beings. An appeal has been made to our Bible which gives us to understand that if our Bible is true, my position is not true; and if the Bible has taught a doctrine of that character, we are to conclude that nature does teach the moral perfections of God. We are referred to Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1st chap.: "Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them," or to them; "for God had showed it unto them, for the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." What invisible things are clearly seen? The moral perfections of God? Are they clearly seen? Paul, what do you mean? "Even his eternal *power* and *Godhead*." That is just what I said. His being, His existence, His power and intelligence, it is clear, are manifested by natural religion, but beyond that the Apostle does not affirm that it goes, and he specified the very points to which we referred.

Next, sir, we have a criticism on the expression of our Lord in Mark 26 : 16; and if I am not mistaken, that verse has been quoted uniformly alone, without regard to its context—without regard to anything that is said in connection with it. The text, as quoted, is this: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: he that believeth not shall be damned." This is brought as a charge against the Bible, as threatening the most terrible penalty for unbelief, when it is affirmed a man can not believe without evidence. Well, I shall not disagree with any on that point. I do not believe a man can believe without evidence; nor did the blessed Jesus require that any one should believe without evidence. He expressly declares, as a principle of his religion, that if he had not come and spoken unto them, then they had not had sin. Just look at the connection: "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned," or condemned. Why condemned? Because they did not believe arbitrarily, without evidence? No, sir. He directed his disciples to preach the gospel—good news—glad tidings—the gospel that the God of Nature never preached, and never can—the gospel of a future life by a resurrection from the dead. He told them to go and preach, and the apostles did go and preach that gospel.

The gospel of Jesus Christ is the proclamation, the glad tidings to a benighted world, that the God of Nature has failed to enlighten, that there is another life, which may be obtained by the dying children of men; and that that life is God's appointment through the Lord Jesus Christ, and by him, and through him *alone*. These were the tidings to a dark world, speculating, unable to find out what was beyond the dark clouds of death. "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The God of Nature teaches no such principle of self-revival. It remains for the glad tidings and good news of God to bring to view the possibility of obtaining immortality and eternal life.

To talk, then, about an arbitrary command to believe without evidence, is talking wrongfully against the Bible. No, sir, I am free to admit, if you please, that the God of the Bible does appeal to man's reason; and I am willing to even go a step further, if my friends on the other side will like it better, and so far as to say that whatever may profess to be a revelation that contradicts palpably, plainly, true reason, is not a subject of belief.

I notice another criticism which we have had on this occasion, which is in the 23rd chapter of Matthew: "Then spake Jesus to the multitude, and to his disciples, saying, The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not." It is said here that our Lord Jesus Christ requires that whatever the Pharisees bid them observe and do, they were to do. Where did they sit? In Moses' seat. Then to the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. If the Scribes and Pharisees did not speak according to the law and to the testimony, Jesus never commanded them to obey them—never. There has been something said in the course of these remarks by our friends on the opposite side about the Mosaic priesthood, about the corruptions of the Jewish priesthood, as if that were an argument against the religious institutions of Moses. I beg, right at this point, to be indulged with the privilege of reading a remark of Dr. McCulloh, in his work to which I have be-

fore referred. In 1st volume of his work, page 209, he says:

"Though the prophets always urged the nation in the most earnest manner to a strict observance of the institutions of Moses, it is abundantly evident that they could not have formed any party with the priesthood; for not only have they entirely abstained from *commending* the order, but their writings are full of censures and denunciations against them for transgressing the laws of Jehovah, and for failing in their moral duties toward the nation at large. It is hardly necessary to remark that Jeremiah and Ezekiel the only two prophets taken from the priestly tribe, are as express in their censures of the priesthood as other prophets." He adds, in a note, "Collins, the Deist, was so much struck with the amount of censure cast by the prophets upon the priesthood, that he terms them,"—these prophets—"free-thinkers, not discerning that though the prophets censured the irreligion or the immorality of the priests when they had thus transgressed, yet they universally sustained the institutions of Moses in the most urgent manner, as being constitutions of Jehovah. However, the observation of this writer is important; for even his superficial examination of the prophetical writings was sufficient to show him that there could be no collusion between the prophets and the priesthood."

These prophets, then, do denounce the corruption and wickedness of the priesthood, and denounce it so severely, that even this intelligent Deist was constrained to acknowledge there could be no collusion between them. But, sir, it has been said here, on this stand, that the Mosaic priesthood was a "contemptible foolery." If I were disposed to retalitate—but I am not—I would say that another criticism that I am about to notice is a most "contemptible" criticism, but I wont use the word only as borrowed.

The remarks which I am about to read, you will find extracted from Dr. McCulloh, in his work, page 240. Dr. McCulloh, says:

"Lord Bollingbroke, however inimical to the theory of the divine constitution of Christianity, has not hesitated to render the clearest testimony to its excellent morality, as the following extracts from his writings will abundantly show. And his observations on the subject of theological teaching not only is creditable to his discernment, but does justice to the actual merits of Christianity, which most other Deists have endeavored to confound with the false teachings of men."

That is just what is being attempted here. Lord Bolingbroke says in his 4th essay, section 5th:

"The gospel teaches universal benevolence, recommends the precepts of it, and commends the observance of it in particular instances occasionally, always supposes them, always enforces them, and makes the law of right reason a law in every possible definition of the word beyond all cavil.—I say beyond all cavil, because a great deal of *silly cavil* has been employed to perplex the plainest things in nature, and the best determined signification of words according to the different occasions on which they were used."

He makes the law of right reason a law in the definition of the word, "*beyond all cavil.*" There, sir, I believe in Lord Bolingbroke's right-reason observation. That is a noble sentiment; I take delight in praising it, coming from a man called a Deist. He was a man that rejected the Bible as a revelation, but was a beliver in God. I will read another extract from the same author. He says:

"The gospel of Christ is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice, of benevolence, and of universal charity."

Is such the testimony we have heard in this place from the followers of Lord Bolingbroke? I hardly dare say followers. No, sir. The Bible has been attacked by "silly cavil." It has been attempted by such a cavil to show that the Lord Jesus condemned even the desire of marriage.—We come now to that text as recorded in the 5th chapter of Matthew, on which the cavil or criticism was made: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." It was said here (by Mr. Wright), that Jesus declared that whosoever looketh on a woman to *desire* her for his *wife* was an adulterer. I call that a "*silly cavil.*" We will not call it "a contemptible foolery." It is a perversion of the words of Jesus, as palpable as the shining of the noon-day sun. Turn with me, then, to the 19th chapter and 3rd verse: "The Pharisees also came unto Jesus, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he who made them at the beginning, made them male and female? For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh; wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh; what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." I ask any intelligent man or woman in this congregation if we are not right in applying Lord Bolingbroke's expression, "silly cavil," to such an interpretation of these words of Jesus as was given by persons on the opposite side of the question?

If I were defending a cause that needed such a cavil, I should certainly be led to believe that it was a doubtful one. (Applause.)

Speak with calmness and deliberation on all occasions, specially in circumstances that tend to irritate.

A WARNING TO CHRISTIANS

"Then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another; and many false prophets shall arise, and shall deceive many; *and because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.* But he that shall endure unto the end, shall be saved."—Matt. 24: 10-13.

It is well known that seasons of great and general excitement, whether arising from political or other causes, are fraught with danger to the mental stability of many individuals. There are times when some dreadful epidemic seems to seize hold of the *minds* of men, when a blind excitement pervades all classes; and few escape the infection. Times of war and revolution are eminently such, and tend greatly to unsettle men's minds, and to work them up into an unhealthy feverish state, creating a morbid desire for an unwholesome stimulus. When events occur which powerfully affect the general mind, when nations are roused into energetic and unwonted action; when old established and world-wide systems are verging on dissolution, then is the individual mind, even of the man of God, liable to be unbalanced, to lose, as it were, its foot hold, and be silently but surely borne away, by the passion that sways the hour, into the gulf of forgetfulness of God; such times were impending when Jesus replied to his disciples' question, and the same warnings and injunctions given *them* will apply to all similar occasions. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." "See that *ye* be not troubled; in your patience possess ye your souls," that is, in patient continuance in well-doing, possess the mastery over your own minds; be not carried away by the prevailing spirit. Be watchful and prayerful. Such is the tenor of some of the injunctions, given in view of the approaching evils.

It will be evident to all who take notice of the course of public and political events, and who does not, in these latter days, when so many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased? that events of no common import are about to transpire. The voices of the prophets, with one consent, testify that national convulsions, famines, pestilences, earthquakes, &c., must precede the much-desired era of rest and peace under the Messiah. The proclamation of Joel rings in our ears, "Prepare war, wake up the mighty men; let all the men of war draw near, let them come up; beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears; assemble and come all ye nations, and gather yourselves together round about." We already see the greater part of the world in arms, and we look, also, for the crumbling to pieces of an old established system, corrupted from its original divine simplicity, grown old in wantonness and crime, joined with the rulers of the world in an unholy union, that they might "eat up God's people, as if they were bread;" we look for the day when the proud shall be abased, and the "Lord alone be exalted." But the overthrow of Babylon will be mighty, and how many noble beings may be involved in her fall? As it is said in the book of Daniel, "Many of them of understanding shall fall through seducers, who shall cleave to them by flatteries."

Whether these things are at hand or not, the fact remains; a war spirit is abroad, a spirit of hatred and delusion. It is its contaminating influence that we fear,—it is the demoralizing influence of familiarity with the ideas of war and bloodshed' —it is the unhealthy excitement,—the bitter party spirit, that is, evil, and causes evil to spread.

Let it not be said there is no danger to Christ's disciples from these causes. There *is danger*, because "when iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Such are the mysterious and inexplicable sympathies which bind man to man, which forbid a separate and isolated interest, that we catch unconsciously the prevalent tone, and we know not till the mind is warped and unsettled, and thus, being in an unhealthy state, it is ready to receive and to conceive evil. The *moral* scourge is more destructive even than the pestilence.

In extraordinary times, God will grant to his chosen extraordinary help. Of this blessed truth we have many assurances; but our space forbids their transcription. The reader may turn to Job 5: 17–24; Isaiah 33: 10–17; Ps. 33; and many other passages to the same purpose.

In view of the evils which are certainly coming upon us, and of others which may be near, how ought the believers in Jesus to be drawing closer and firmer, the bonds of christian and brotherly love, so that united, they may the better resist the insidious approach of disaffection to the "cross of Christ." That, united, they may watch over and strengthen one another; and by keeping aloof from the spirit of the world, "build themselves up in their most holy faith," and, "having done all, to stand with their loins girt about with truth, their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, and their hearts filled with the love of God; praying always, with all perseverance and supplication for all saints, as well as for themselves."

The time must come when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, when the veil which custom, reserve, or prudence has drawn over the faces of most men, shall be torn away. Then will "the sinners in Zion be afraid," *then* will "fearfulness surprise the hypocrites," Is. 33: 14. The words of Jesus, "many shall be offended, and shall betray one another; and because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold,"—ring the death knell of many a fair profession.

Let then the followers of Jesus, who are seeking for glory, honor, and incorruptibility, bethink themselves, and in view of the dangers to which the tone and stability of the individual mind is exposed, from the stir and the excitement, and the party spirit, now working amongst the people; let them exercise caution, watchfulness, and prayer; let them use self-denial, self-possession, self-control, and faith in God's promises; let them be earnest and diligent in every good work, that they may be marked out as people who look beyond the present world, and who recognise the hand of God in all events. Let them not be led away by the spirit of the time, but strive the more earnestly to live "soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world, looking for the appearing of the great God and our Saviour. And may the Lord direct their hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ."—*Moncrieff's Expositor, Scotland.*

Letters from Donors to our Aid.

We have given some extracts from such letters, but think not best to do so uniformly, as there is a similarity in the kind expressions of sympathy, which—though refreshing to our own mind, and received with gratitude by us—is, perhaps, not best to continue before our readers. We shall continue to acknowledge the amount received and give the donor's name unless otherwise desired. We give in this number the following extracts from letters containing donations.

—

From Dr. A. B. Pope, Columbia, Mo.

Br. Storrs—Your last BIBLE EXAMINER brought the unpleasant news of your loss by fire. I have been a reader and subscriber of the EXAMINER from its commencement, and I confess that it has been to me a key that has unlocked the Bible to my vision. It has torn away the dark mist of spiritualism that has been so long practiced by the so-called *orthodoxy*, to the obscuration of the plainest language. In short, sir, your BIBLE EXAMINER has saved me from infidelity; though I am called by the *orthodoxy*, an infidel, it passes as the idle wind, believing that they have not the reward of *life* to bestow, or the punishment of *death* to inflict.

This being true, that it has been the means of saving me from so frightful an abyss as that of infidelity, can I pass by without dropping in my mite, to relieve one who has labored so faithfully in the cause of *the Truth* and *the Life*? No, Brother; take this mite; and may Christ, who testified to the Truth, put it into the hearts of all who read the EXAMINER, to come up at once with their mites, to the relief of one whose vocation is giving light, and opening the way of life, to poor benighted fallen man.

The amount I send is small, but I hope all the brethren can spare you that much, and if so, and they do it at once, it will put you again in a position to do much good.

—

From Geo. Fisher, Slatersville, R. I.

Br. Storrs;— . . . We trust that you will be amply sustained by the friends of the EXAMINER. It is our prayer that every friend of the cause will throw in their mite.

My father, John P. Fisher, sends you $2; my brother, A. Fisher, sends $2, and I send $3,—$7 in all,—with our prayers that God may bless it to you ten-fold. Go on dear brother with your good work: and if you are not recompensed in this life, you will be at the resurrection of the just.

—

From Levi Boughton, Victor, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—Please accept the enclosed as a free-will offering from the church in Victor. We are sorry you have met with loss, but think the good brethren will make it up to you; and we hope more too. May you be prospered in scattering the fables of the present age, and in establishing the truth of God's blessed Word, to the life of thousands. I feel more than ever attached to the truth of the Word. We, as a church, are still holding on to the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of our blessed Lord. Time is giving place to events which give strength to our hope. Yours in love, looking for life in Christ.

—

From R. A. Sherman, Woodstock, Conn.

Br. Storrs:—Having heard of your loss, and desiring to assist you in the cause of truth in which you are engaged, I send *two* dollars for the EXAMINER one year. I believe the great truth of life through Christ, which you advocate, is making progress by the circulation of the EXAMINER. I can say it is a source of information to me.

Yours in hope of life when Christ shall come.

—

From C. F. Sweet, Ulster, Pa.

Br. Storrs:—I hope your loss by fire will be the means, in the hands of God, of trying the faith of many, and that they will not be satisfied with saying, Be ye warmed and fed, and go on in your labor of love in heralding the truth of Eternal Life through Christ alone, while they withhold the means necessary to meet the demands. . . . I could but sit down and weep, in looking over the two last EXAMINERS, to see the prompt liberality of those brethren who have shown their faith by their works, and their love, not in word and tongue only, but in deed and truth. Great must be their consolation when they think Jesus saith, He that gives a cup of cold water shall not lose his reward. "The Books" will be opened by-and-by, and then he that hath lent to the Lord will be recompensed.

As ever, yours in hope of *real life*.

—

DONATIONS to our aid since April 15th:—Dr. A. B. Pope, $3; Joseph Eaton, $3; Mrs. Ursula Eaton, $1,50; Mrs. Anne Potter, 50 cents; from a "friend," $2; H. H. Hall, $1,40; John P. Fisher, $2; A. Fisher, $2; G. Fisher, $3; the Church in Victor, N. Y., by Levi Boughton, $10; C. F. Sweet, $1; H. E. Carver, $1; A. C. Locke, $1; H. G. Armstrong, $5.

All these friends may be assured their liberal aid has deeply affected our heart; and our prayer is to God for His rich blessing upon you all.

A FREE TRANSLATION of Hebrews 4 : 12, from the Irish Scriptures, taken from the "Irish Evangelist."

For the word of God, the preached gospel, by which we are invited to enter into the rest of God, is a living powerful principle, more searching and piercing, and cuts keener than a sword having two edges, effecting not merely the body, but also acts on the mind, and makes a separation between the soul and spirit,—that is, showing up both the animal and spiritual passions, and laying open the concealed parts of the animal constitution, and reading the secret thoughts of the heart.

BIBLE VERSUS TRADITION, by Aaron Ellis; published at the office of the BIBLE EXAMINER, 130 Fulton street.—In an age of controversy like the present, this work will be read with nervous attention. The learned author appears a profound adept as an interpreter of the letter, how far he is guided by the spirit is for the "Father of Spirits" to determine. Professors of theology cannot but feel interested by investigating the merits of such a publication, and, from the tenor of his inferences, drawn from a most momentous subject, we should pronounce Mr. Ellis a sincere philanthropist. The public will judge for themselves. The work is produced by the publisher in a style which must be highly gratifying to the author.

The foregoing notice we copy from the Editorial of the "*New York Mercantile Guide.*" We are glad the conductors of that paper are not afraid to notice such a work, while only one other paper in this city—viz: "*The Tribune*,"—has condescended to notice it at all, though we have sent a copy to a number.

We would be pleased if notices of it embraced the name of BR. READ as well as that of BRO. ELLIS. Certainly the work would never have appeared in its present form and style, but for the labor of BR. THOMAS READ. He not only re-wrote the entire manuscript of Br. Ellis, but supplied a large portion of the matter it contains. Much credit is due to Br. Ellis for his patient and long-continued search of the Scriptures and collection of texts on particular words; but the final arrangement, revision, careful examination of the whole work, and comparing with the original, and various authors on the original terms, with the addition of a large amount of new and original matter, was the work of Br. Read, and cost him months of close study and labor.

We have some very interesting facts relating to the good this work has accomplished. A gentlemanly man called at our office a few days since, with a copy of the first edition—thoroughly worn by use—and said, "Six months ago I cared nothing for the Bible, but since I obtained this *key* the Bible has become the most interesting book in the world." His book gave evidence that he studied it thoroughly, and he was anxious to have it "scattered by thousands." Br. Ham speaks thus of it in his *Christian Examiner* for April:—

A very valuable contribution towards the settlement of the controversey concerning the Scripture doctrine of human immortality and its related topics. The author of this work has thoroughly studied the subjects on which he writes, and by a very copious induction of Scripture passages has brought to bear an amount of evidence in support of his own theory which is quite overwhelming. Its size will, we fear, preclude it from being the best pioneer in these controversies, but it should be the *vade mecum* of all who wish to be well informed therein, and well furnished for the battle of truth.

"Its size" is no impediment to its circulation in this country, but rather an advantage, as those who wish to examine the subject want more than they can find in smaller works; yet works of less magnitude may do better for "pioneers:" such we intend to issue. Price of Bible vs. Tradition, 75 cents. Ten copies for $5.

MAP OF THE SEAT OF WAR.—Many persons are entirely ignorant of the scene of war now opened in Europe and Asia, and hence read accounts of the conflict with indistinct ideas, and much less interest than they would if they understood its location. As the subject is likely to be one of the deepest importance the world ever witnessed, and to open the most tremendous events, a good Map, embracing the places concerned in the war, is a desirable object. Such a Map is published in this city, and we will furnish it, to those who may wish, at 37 cents; or sent by mail and postage paid, for 40 cents. It is about two feet square, and nicely colored. Any person can trace the movements of the conflicting powers on it, and hence read the reports, from time to time, with a better understanding. Every family should have one. We will send three to one address, for $1, and pay the postage.

"AN APPEAL *to Men of Reason and Common Sense.*"—This Tract is now for sale at 60 cents per 100: per 1000, $5.

"THE IMPERATIVE NATURE OF DUTY."—Br. C. F. Hudson informs us that he has a few copies of this work, which can be had of him at Cincinnati, Ohio, for 12 cents per copy. The amount can be sent him in Post Office *Stamps*. See our notice of the work April 1st, p. 98.

"THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE DIGNITY OF HUMAN NATURE, AND THE END OF EVIL:" "*The Paradox of Penalty*; or, *Too Fearful, Unfeared*," and "*The Missionary Spirit, as affected by the doctrine of Specific Immortality.*"

Such are the topics BR. C. F. HUDSON intends presenting in a Pamphlet of about 75 pages; to which, he says, "A few doctrinal propositions may be added, in the form of Notes."

The Pamphlet will be retailed at about 25 cts., with a discount by the quantity. It will be issued as soon as orders sent shall indicate the proper size of the edition.

We hope Br. H. may be encouraged to issue it immediately, and he may count on us for 50 copies.

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY,

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED

At No. 130

TERMS---One

Always

GEO. STORRS, EDIT

S C

Or the Hebrew word Nep

BY REV. WM. GLEN

PSUCHE.

[Continued

We now proceed to which is the Greek ter considered. No other ment is ever rendered " fifty-nine times.

SEC. I. *Psuche* radic there is no decided exam Its verb is *psucho*, to br

SEC. II. *Psuche* is the Old Testament, ren other word for life, it i sages we now refer to t able.

Matt. 6: 25, "Take (*psuche*). 16: 25, "W (*psuchen*) shall lose it; life (*psuchen*) for my sa "The son of man came ransom for many." Th diction of Isa. 53: 12, soul (*naphesho*) unto d up his life—hath died. ——to save life (*psuch* 26, "hazarded their brethren." 20: 10, "t his life (*psuche*) is in hi by perceive we the lov down his life (*psuchen*) f down our lives (*psuchas* 8: 19, "And the third p were in the sea, and had

There are some passag dered *soul*, and where, we reader will admit that it *life*; at any rate we ca should not. It would, w so rendered had not the influenced the translators consciously, in their valu

Before advancing to t reader, if he will grant t over the preceding verses

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, MAY 15, 1854. NO. 10.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SOUL:

Or the Hebrew word Nephesh and Greek word Psuche.

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

PSUCHE. (*Greek Term.*)

[Continued from page 132.]

We now proceed to give an account of *psuche*, which is the Greek term *parallel* to the one just considered. No other term in the New Testament is ever rendered "*soul*," and it is so translated fifty-nine times.

SEC. I. *Psuche* radically means *breath*, of which there is no decided example in the New Testament. Its verb is *psucho*, to breathe, or blow.

SEC. II. *Psuche* is frequently, like *nephesh*, in the Old Testament, rendered "*life*." There is another word for life, it is *zoe:* in most of the passages we now refer to they are perfectly exchangeable.

Matt. 6: 25, "Take no thought for your life" (*psuche*). 16: 25, "Whosoever will save his life (*psuchen*) shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life (*psuchen*) for my sake shall find it." 20: 28, "The son of man came to give his life (*psuchen*) a ransom for many." Thus he would fulfill the prediction of Isa. 53: 12, "He hath poured out his soul (*naphesho*) unto death," &c.—hath rendered up his life—hath died. Mark 3: 4, "Is it lawful ——to save life (*psuchen*), or to kill?" Acts 15: 26, "hazarded their lives (*psuchas*) for their brethren." 20: 10, "trouble not yourselves for his life (*psuche*) is in him." 1 John 3: 16, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life (*psuchen*) for us; and we ought to lay down our lives (*psuchas*) for the brethren." Rev. 8: 19, "And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had life (*psuchas*), died."

There are some passages where the word is rendered *soul*, and where, we feel confident, a reflecting reader will admit that it had been better translated *life;* at any rate we can devise no reason why it should not. It would, we verily believe, have been so rendered had not the dogma of immortal-soulism influenced the translators, as it would do, even unconsciously, in their valuable and pious labors.

Before advancing to the texts alluded to, let the reader, if he will grant the author this favor, run over the preceding verses, and, instead of "life" insert *soul* in each of them, and he will discover that the Bible idea of *soul* is considerably different from the common one in our day. "Hazarded their souls," for instance, how would that read? "We ought to lay down our souls for the brethren," how would that sound? Lay down our immortal-souls, would surely be an awful idea, truly. "He that saveth his soul, shall lose it"–! We affirm that by attaching the Bible idea to the term *soul*, the expression is most appropriate, and awfully instructive. Understand that the word soul here imports *life*, and all is plain; and this very word is given in the received rendering, and justly so, "He that saveth his life, shall lose it."

The following are the passages we have proposed to consider, and as briefly as possible.

Luke 12: 20, "But God said unto him, thou fool, this night thy soul (*psuchen*) shall be required of thee (margin, do they require thy soul); then whose shall these things be which thou hast provided?"

In not farther than two verses after this text, v. 22, the same word is rendered *life*—"take no thought for your life (*psuche*) what ye shall eat," &c.; and why should not the *same word* be translated "*life*" here? The meaning is substantially this—to-night thou shalt die. Of what use are treasures to a dead man?

Matt. 16: 26, "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? (*psuchen*) or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (*psuchen*). See also Mark 8: 37.

Let the reader open his English Testament and examine the verse immediateiy before the one quoted, and in it he will find the term *life* two times. Will he believe that it is just the same word, rendered soul in the text? It is so, strange as it may appear to him, "For whosoever will save his life (*psuehen*) shall loose it, and whosoever will loose his life (*psuchen*) for my sake shall find it." With their idea of a *soul*, it would have sounded very strange, assuredly, for the translators to have rendered that verse thus, "For whosoever will lose his soul for my sake shall find it." But for this rendering there is no less authority than for the one in the verse we are considering. Why "life" in v. 25, and "soul" in verse 26? The terms are the same—there is no foregoing adjective to hint that the *psuche* in v. 26 is different from the *psuche* in v. 25; and, since the terms are the same, why not *both* "SOUL," or *both* "LIFE?"

Though it is rather anticipating, it may be well to observe, that we are fully convinced that these passages—Matt. 16: 25, 26—are instances in which *psuche* is employed to express personality, or self. Our Lord, in the parallel passage in Luke, omits the *psuche* altogether; and his words there explain the phraseology in Matt. and Mark, and

bear out the observation we have just made. His words in Luke 9: 25 are, "For what is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and LOSE HIMSELF, or be a cast-away."

Matt. 10: 28, "And fear not them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (*psuchen*); but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul (*psuchen*) and body in hell"—Gehenna.

a. In many other passages, as already shown, we learn that the "soul" can be killed by man; and, also, that it is the duty of Christians to render up their souls (*psuchas*) or lives for the brethren.

b. There is no term in this verse that would draw any distinction between a *soul* that men cannot kill and one that they can; between a soul that men cannot quench, but that God, and God only, can destroy. It is the same word without the shadow of an adjectival qualification or distinction.

c. Observe, had the text even read there is a soul in man which no persecutor can kill, it distinctly affirms that that soul can be destroyed by the Divine power, and intimates very plainly that it shall be destroyed in the case of every apostate. So that an *indestructible soul*, however common language in this day, is as unscriptural as the *destructable Creator* would be.

d. The only legitimate manner of interpreting the text is, in our humble opinion, to understand it as affirming that God only can destroy a soul, a life, a human being's existence forever; and that this will be the doom of all apostates and of all the ungodly. Persecutors may destroy a Christian's life now, and for a little, but, at "the last day" he will be raised to "glory, honor, and immortality." When God destroys a man, a soul, a life, or a living being in Gehenna, he is quenched forever; the second death is to be followed by no resurrection. He that findeth his life, he who keeps his life at the expense of his love to Jesus, shall at last lose it in Gehenna's fire; and he that loseth his life (*psuchen*), or lays it down for Jesus, shall find it at the resurrection of the just, and retain it through unending ages. Matt. 10: 29.

It is worthy of observation that, in the parallel words of our Lord as given by Luke, the word "soul" does not occur. "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." (12: 4, 5.) "After he hath killed," that is, killed men, as he has often done, by his judgments in this state, hath power, after their resurrection and the final assize, to destroy them in the fire of Gehenna, with a destruction which is to be everlasting, or which is to be followed by no return to conscious being. It is the second death. Persecutors, then, can only, by their murderous acts, at most, suspend conscious being, or destroy life for a short period; God can obliterate the man forever, and will do so in the case of all his impenitent and apostate subjects, therefore fear Him!

SEC. III. *Psuche* is also frequently used to express the idea of *personality* or *self*. For example, Matt. 11: 29, "ye shall find rest unto your souls" (*psuchais*), i. e., to yourselves. 26: 38, "My soul (*psuche*) is exceeding sorrowful even unto death;" i. e., *I* am exceeding, &c. Luke 1: 46, "My soul (*psuche*) doth magnify the Lord," i. e., *I* do magnify, &c. Acts 2: 41, "Three thousand souls" (*psuchas*) i. e., men. 14: 22, "Confirming the souls (*psuchas*) of the disciples;" i. e., confirming *the disciples*. 15: 24, "subverting your souls" (*psuchas*) i. e., subverting *you*. Rom. 13: 1, "Let every soul (*psuche*) be subject;" i. e., Let every one, or every *man*, &c. Heb. 13: 17, "they watch for your souls" (*psuchas*), or, for *you*. 2 Pet. 2: 8, "vexed his righteous soul" (*psuchen*), i. e., *self;* or, vexed himself a righteous person. Jas. 1: 21, "able to save your souls" (*psuchas*); i. e., to save *you*. 5: 20, "save a soul (*psuche*) from death;" i. e., save *a man* from death. Instead of translating the word (*psuchon*), our version has simply *you*, in 2 Cor. 12: 15, "I will very gladly spend and be spent for you" (margin, *your souls*.)

SEC. IV. Since *psuche* designates a living man, it is natural to suppose, that like *nephesh*, it will also be applied to men dead. Of this usage, there are, in our opinion, examples in the Revelation.

Rev. 20: 4, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, and (or even) I saw the souls (*psuchas*) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus—and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

The "souls of them" are *the men themselves*. John saw the dead martyrs in his vision. He also beheld the souls live, "they lived," that is, the slain men were made alive and reigned with Christ.

Rev. 6: 9, 10, "and when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls (*psuchas*) of them (the men themselves) that were slain——and they (the dead souls, or dead men) cried with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth."

By turning to Isa. 14, the reader will see dead kings and mighty ones, represented rising up, as if they were really alive, and addressing the fallen monarch of Babylon when entering among them, now as weak as themselves. In perusing the chapter let the reader bear in mind that they are in *hell*, or *sheol*, of which our explanation has been briefly given.

SEC. V. *Psuche* sometimes denotes a particular power, or mental state of a man, though it is not always easy to settle what the reference exactly is.

Mark 12: 30, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul" (*psuche*), &c. On which Barnes has this note, "They are required to love God above all other beings or things, and with all the faculties of their minds." Acts 4: 32, "the multitude——were of one heart and of one soul" (*psuche*); which is, according to Bloomfield, "a proverbial description of *close amity*." They were unanimous. 19: 2, "made their minds (*psuchais*) evil affected;" i. e., made *them* evil affected. Eph. 6: 6, "Doing the will of God from the heart" (*psuches*). "God requires industry, fidelity, conscientiousness, submission, and obedience in that rank of life."—Barnes. Phil. 1: 27, "with one mind (*psuche*) striving to-

gether for the faith," &c.; i. e., striving unanimously and with zeal. 1 Thes. 5 : 23, "I pray God your whole spirit, soul (*psuche*) and body, be preserved blameless," &c. Robinson, in his Greek Lexicon, under pneuma, 2 b, justly says, "spirit, soul, and body is a periphrasis *for the whole man.*" The same may be said of the preceding passage, Mark 12 : 30. Heb. 4 : 12, "piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul (*psuche*) and spirit, and of the joints and marrow," &c.

Without inquiring minutely what is meant here by soul, and spirit, and the dividing of them asunder, it seems wisest to regard the whole verse as giving a strong representation of the possible effects of God's word on the whole man. It penetrates the depths of his being; reaches and searches him in every point; lays bare his inmost thoughts and most hidden depravities.

Heb. 12 : 3, "lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds" (*psuch*ais). Is it not enough to say —lest ye be wearied and faint?

SEC. VI. *Psuche*, in one passage, obviously imports a *fish*.

"Rev. 16 : 3, "and every living soul (*psuche*) died in the sea." With this compare Gen. 1 : 21, 24, &c. Part I. Sec. 3.

REMARKS.—1st. From the preceding pages is it not fully evident that the scriptural idea of a *soul*, and the theological one, are as different as could be imagined? As for "immortal souls," and "deathless souls," and "unquenchable souls," &c., the Book knows nothing of them: such language is common in prayers, sermons, treatises, and even newspapers, but the very opposite is the inspired representation of our nature. Dust we are, and unto dust we shall return. Men are mortal; we need to "seek for" immortality, Rom. 2 : 7. The Bible description of man is "*corruptible* man," Rom. 1 : 23. "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. 6 : 23.

2d. If to be a *soul*, is to be immortal, then all breathing animals in the world, great as the elephant, small as the insect, are immortal also, for they are as much souls as man. Part I., SEC. III. Do none of these creatures die? Is it not true that the beasts perish?

3d. Since the *soul* of man is the fragile *life* of a man, or simply the mortal man himself, it is evident that, when a man dies, a soul dies; when a man is destroyed, a soul is destroyed; and when a man is saved from death, a soul is saved from dissolution and corruption. Thus, when a man dies he becomes necessarily as if he *had never been*. This fact is explicitly affirmed in Job 10 : 18, 19. So far from continuing to think, his thoughts perish, Ps. 146 : 3, 4,—he now knows nothing, Ecc. 9 : 5, 6,—he, however pious before death, cannot now praise the Lord, Ps. 115 : 17,—he is *asleep* till the resurrection trumpet shall sound, Dan. 12 : 2; 1 Thes. 4 : 14.

4th. The only prospect of the dead recovering consciousness, is, therefore, by a resurrection. Hence the importance of that scriptural doctrine —a doctrine now nearly forgotten, at least rendered, through the dogma of immortal-soulism, singularly valueless. We are helped thus to see the force of Paul's language, and it is only in the light thrown by Scripture on man, that it can be at all accurately understood,—"if Christ be not raised—they (the believing MEN) also which are *fallen asleep* are PERISHED;" i. e., they have ceased to be forever. "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink for to-morrow WE DIE." 1 Cor. 15 : 32. How can it be forgotten that the only consolation the Divine Redeemer had for the weeping Martha was, "Thy brother"—has gone to glory? no—"thy brother *shall rise again.*" And what else had Paul for the bereaved Thessalonians? 1 Thes. 4 : 14, 18, "The dead in Christ *shall rise* first."

5th. Glory be to the Son of God who hath brought "life and immortality"—incorruptible life —"to light through the gospel," 2 Tim. 1 : 10. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept," 1 Cor. 15 : 20,23.

How awfully the Life-Giver, the blessed Redeemer—who is the only Immortalizer—has been dishonored, by telling men that they are all immortal beings! To the wicked it is said, their "end is destruction," and how can good men continue to affirm their end is *preservation; life*, instead of *death*? "The wicked shall *perish*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they *shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away.*" Ps. 37 : 20.

6th. At present believers have a constitution of being similar to Adam, of whom it is written, "the first man Adam was made (*into*, Greek *eis*) a living soul," 1 Cor. 15 : 45, Gen. 2 : 7. This is the animal state, or the state in which human beings live by breathing, out of which every one may ascend to a higher constitution or sublimer mode of existence, as all the true saints ultimately shall. This second stage, or state, is called the *spiritual* one, in Cor. 15 : 46, "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural (*psuchikon*—literally, *soulish* or *soulical*), and afterwards that which is *spiritual;*" for, the Apostle says, "there is a natural (*psuchikon—soulical*) body," or being, "and there is a spiritual body," or being, v. 44. Speaking of the dead saints and their resurrection, he declares, "It is sown (laid in the grave) a natural (soulical) body," or they lie down soulical; "it is raised a spiritual body," or they are resurrected spiritual, v. 44. Into this, the higher and purer state of humanity, the living saints will be instantaneously changed at our Lord's appearing; and all must undergo this transformation, that is, be *spiritualized*, whatever may be the full import of the glorious language used when describing their destiny, since "flesh and blood (soulical humanity?) cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither doth corruption inherit incorruption," v. 50. But, blessed be God, every saint may exclaim, "as we have borne the image of the earthly (Adam), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (the Lord from heaven), v. 47.

It seems, then, scriptural to tell men that through the Redeemer they may yet be spiritualized, or *become spirits*. At present men have a spirit—"the spirit of life from God"—Rev. 11 : 11, that

evanishes when the man (*it* is not the man) dies, like his thoughts which perish on that very day. Ps. 146: 3, 4; but in the kingdom of God men may live as spirits yet, equal to the angels of light. That is the second, the perfect, the spiritual, the divine condition of humanity; and in this state Jesus himself now exists, the model and the fountain of the change that is, ere long, to be wrought upon his martyrs and friends.

So far, then, from *souls* being immortal, the Scripture teaches us, when it is rightly understood, that it ought to be our holy ambition, and our earnest prayer, that we may yet *cease to be souls* and *become spirits*. Souls are not immortal; men must merge into *spirits* if they are to live for ever in the incorruptible kingdom. The *soulical* form of humanity must perish, being corruptible, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" spirit alone abides, since it alone is adapted for ceaseless duration. Thrice blessed are they who shall *cease to be souls*, or creatures living by breathing; and become like the spiritual Lord from heaven, when he descends the second time without sin unto salvation. Amen. Alleluia.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS—THE MORAL POWER OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Continued from page 135.]

The significance of the cross would be only partially apprehended were it viewed in no other aspect than as the symbol of a model obedience. Christ came into the world to exemplify a perfect righteousness, hence "he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," and has thus set us an example that we should follow his steps." But this was not the whole of his mission as the mediator between God and man. Not only does the human race need a model righteousness, they need a *motive* beyond that supplied in the moral beauty of an exemplary personal perfection, to stimulate them to that dutiful course of personal obedience which God demands. The loveliest moral image, as has been proved in the history of Christ, would, by itself, fail to evoke the spiritual sympathies of our degenerate race, and effect our reformation. Righteousness provokes as well as purifies, and stirs up hate as well as admiration. "They have both seen and hated both me and my Father." Holiness of character, under the present conditions of humanity, is only to be secured by taking the heart captive: if no successful appeal has been made to the affections, the intellectual and moral judgments will be appealed to in vain. Love to God, without which there is no obedience to God, is begotten within us by the perception of his love to us—"We love him, because he first loved us." Mankind need to be wooed in order to be won for God; and God has graciously condescended, through the medial agency of his Son, to so address himself to them. "Son, give me thine heart," is his kindly claim. "Yea, I have loved thee," we hear him say, "with an everlasting love; therefore with loving-kindness have I drawn thee." And no less true is it of all the "household of faith," as well as of Ephraim of old, that God "drew them with the cords of a man, with bands of love." Now the cross of Christ supplies this *motive*—this drawing power; and because it supplies it in the strongest degree, it is commonly represented in the New Testament as the primary agency in our personal conversion. Thus Christ is said to have "made peace through the blood of the cross," to have reconciled "both in one body by the cross," to have "redeemed us to God by his blood." Thus sinners, who are "far off" in moral alienation from God, are said to be "made nigh by the blood of Christ," and to be "bought with a price," even "with the precious blood of Christ." These and similar expressions imply that the cross of Christ, on which he shed his life's blood, has become an active moral agency in the Christian scheme of human redemption. Here, by the prominence given to it in the New Testament, is obviously concentrated the strength of the Christian salvation. Here lies the secret of Christ's success as the moral "power of God." The cross is the gauge of Christ's love. It is the eloquent utterance of a love stronger than reproach, ignominy, and death. It tells, in most trustful tones, the tenderness of his loving heart. Thus far would Christ go, if thus much should be involved in his mediatorial agency in behalf of the sons of men. If it should cost not only personal inconvenience, self-denial, and suffering both of body and mind, but also an ignominious death, to effectually ransom the human race from the power of sin and its punishment, then would Christ pay even this high price for an object so dear to him. "For the joy that was set before him" he willingly "endured the cross, despising the shame." But it was a woful necessity that was laid upon him, to bear his cross to Calvary, and be brutally murdered thereon. Many a sigh was heaved from his burdened heart as the time drew near for this mighty sacrifice of love. And when at last the "cup" of bitter anguish was put into his trembling hands, as the cruel recompence of his perfect righteousness, with what "strong crying and tears" did he appeal "to him that was able to save him from death!" How agonizingly he holds up in the presence of his Heavenly Father that "cup" of human cruelty and guilt, and thrice deprecates the dreadful ordeal before him, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me!" His body, blood-bedewed with the force of inward wrestlings, utters most eloquently the otherwise unutterable anguish of the "hour" that was then "come." He might have avoided that "hour," for he knew before-hand the anguish of its terrible moments—he knew that as "the Holy One of God," the race he came to ransom would hate and hang him on a tree. But he knew also that if he avoided that "hour" of suffering and self-sacrifice, man had been unransomed, and his salvation had been impossible. For there is no salvation from sin without suffering; and if the Christ of God had declined to become the "way," who else could have effectually walked therein and discovered the path of life? It behoved the Lord Jesus Christ, if he would redeem mankind from sin and death, to set before them in the experience of his own life, the method of this mighty redemption. It behoved him to set before

our fallen race the example of a perfect righteousness, and show us how such a character fares in our guilty world, and how it is rewarded by the righteous God. By the example of Christ we are taught the great lesson that before honor comes humility, and before salvation, suffering and sacrifice. Christ was "made perfect through suffering," to illustrate the inevitable law that there is no personal perfection to be wrought out in this world without suffering. In "striving against sin," he "resisted unto blood," because "the contradiction of sinners against himself" went to the sanguinary length of demanding his blood. He would not shun this sad sequel of his life, because he would not shun any condition of duty, nor refuse any consequence, however painful, of a complete personal obedience. He would show mankind how to live and how to die, that they might see, by his resurrection from the dead, how highly his heavenly Father honors such fidelity, and will reward it in the case of all who endure to the end. Had it not "pleased the Father to bruise him," or "that he should be bruised and put to grief," he could not have been the pattern of our righteousness; his experience, instead of being the exemplification of the law of suffering for righteousness' sake, would have been the singular and solitary exception to that law. Hence the experience of Christ and his saints is one. If he has suffered for righteousness sake, so must they, otherwise they cannot know "the fellowship of his sufferings;"—if he has had a cross, and been "crucified to the world," so must they have a cross, and be willing to take it up "daily," and follow their Lord;—if he has been "obedient unto death," they too must be "made conformable to his death," in readiness of spirit, if not in reality of experience, otherwise their faith is vain, and they are yet in their sins. "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his Lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord."

Such a redemption as the human race needs—a redemption from the active power of sin and its punitive desert, death, obliged the Redeemer to submit to all the conditions and circumstances of the race he came to redeem; and hence his life and death became a *sacrifice*—a sacrifice of *love*. Our *sins*, that is, our habitual selfishness, needed to be rooted out of our moral being, our characters formed on a new model, and our hearts impelled by new motives. These Christ came to accomplish. "He was manifested to take away our sins, and in him is no sin." Hence he needed to be "made in the likeness of sinful flesh," to suffer the assaults of sin in all its manifold forms and intensity, and to demonstrate the possibility of a successful resistance of sin even to the end. The sacrifice was as great as a conflict with the most dangerous and distressing forms of evil could make it. It was a sacrifice for sin—for its repudiation and overthrow. He "bore our sins," as he "took our infirmities and bear our sicknesses," that is, he bore or took them away—the latter by a miraculous, the former by a moral power. [Matt. 8: 17.] But not with equal facility, for to *bare*, or take away, *our sicknesses*, cost him only the utterance of a command; but to *bear*, or take away *our sins*, cost him the exhibition of a character. Our sicknesses fled instantaneously before the power of his voice, but our spiritual sicknesses yield to slower processes, and only before the constant presence, and by the power of his personal virtue. To make such a sacrifice was an act of condescension on Christ's part: it is spoken of as "the *grace* of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." And because it is an act of grace, it appeals to the gratitude of every human heart, and evokes its reverence and love. The spontaneousness of Christ's sacrifice makes the appeal the stronger, and gives it that resistless power which begets repentance in every believing sinner, and achieves his personal reformation. The life of Christ abounds with such appeals—its disinterested devotedness, its self-denials, its painful and unremitting labors in behalf of our race, are so intelligible and influential, that where it obtains an audience, it rarely fails to secure a victory. Its last evidence of love, when "he was led as a lamb to the slaughter," and submitted to the death of the cross, because it was a consequence of the life he had lived in this evil world, and the doctrine and spirit he had taught and manifested, whilst it was the perfection of his obedience, was at the same time the consummation of his power. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." The cross tells the most touching tale of love, and is the symbol of Christ's greatest personal sacrifice; hence it gathers into itself every other utterance of his affection, and engrosses every other act of his self-denial in the cause of our personal redemption. And when, moreover, we view the crucified One as the representative of God—the visible manifestation of the Great Invisible; when we bear in mind that every utterance, every expression of feeling, every action, every endurance of the Christ of God, was not so much to manifest Christ himself, as "*God* in Christ;" when all the love which Jesus expressed both in action and suffering is viewed, as it should be viewed, as the representation, on a human scale, of the feelings and sympathy for man of which God is the subject; then the cross becomes the expression of what is too vast even for itself to adequately declare: it stands before us as the finite guage of an infinite—it is the highest possible utterance of the Love of God! Connect the two mighty facts together, that the cross is the expression of a duplicate love—the love of the Christ, and the love of "God in Christ," and the mystery of the cross is understood—its moral power is obvious and complete. This explains why the cross, or one or other of its synonymes, "the blood of Christ," "the sufferings of Christ," "the death of Christ," is so commonly alluded to in the sacred writings, and presented either as the chief motive to our gratitude, or the chief stimulus to our fidelity. Christianity itself as a religious system, is, for the same reason, comprehensively expressed by the phrase, "the Cross of Christ," for the cross expresses at once the cause and effect of human redemption: it sets

forth *love* as the cause, and a *perfect obedience* as the effect. It is thus, at the same time, an appeal and an admonition. It asks, in the tenderest eloquence, for our hearts; and announces our personal reformation as the object of its request. The cross suggests a moral significance which was not to be found in the symbolism of the former dispensation; and because it was wanting there, that ancient ritual was inefficient as a means of religious reformation and discipline. There was *blood*, it is true, in the Mosaic as well as in the Christian economy; but "the blood of slaughtered animals" could not utter what the blood of Christ did, the voice of an intelligent and irresistible *love;* hence "it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." "Those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually," if they could have made "the comers thereunto perfect" in personal holiness, would "not only have ceased to be offered" by the same persons, but would also have superseded the necessity of any further sacrifice for sins, because the worshippers *once* personally *purged* from their sinfulness, would "have no more conscience of sins." The ancient symbolic service of sacrifice would have continued to this day as the Divinely appointed means for educating and reforming our race, had it been efficient as a means of purification. "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." But the flesh was weak; our nature needed a more emphatic portraiture of piety, and a mightier motive than the Levitical sacrifices afforded. Our moral wreck was too complete to bear to be reconstructed after such a model, and by such means as the older dispensation supplied. Hence, "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," that by the perfection of His living example, and the touching eloquence of His love, we might be incited to a life of personal obedience; and so "the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the [principles of the] flesh, but after [those of] the Spirit." The many sacrifices of the ancient worship were thus superseded by the "one sacrifice" of the new—whose greater moral efficacy is exhibited in effectually putting the Divine laws in our minds, and writing them upon our hearts, so that "by one offering he [Christ] hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

MAN'S WORD *vs.* GOD'S WORD.

MAN'S WORD.—"The Soul of Man is Immaterial and Immortal, and can subsist independently of the Body."—*Dr. Adam Clarke.*

"Man is endowed with an Immortal spirit, which shall exist as long as God endures: either blooming in the paradise of God, or eternally withering, not dying, in the regions of despair!"—*Prof. Harkey, of the Ill. State University.*

GOD'S WORD.—"Till THOU return unto the ground, for out of *it* wast THOU taken; for DUST THOU ART, and unto DUST shalt THOU return."—Gen. 3: 19.

"Shall MORTAL MAN be more just than GOD." Job 4: 17.

"How much less in them that dwell in Houses of clay, whose FOUNDATION is in the DUST, which are crushed before the *moth*."—Job 4: 19.

"For he remembered that they were BUT FLESH, a wind that passeth away and cometh not again."—Ps. 78: 39.

"He knoweth our frame: he remembereth that we are DUST."—Ps. 103: 14.

"How much less man that is a WORM, and the son of man which is a WORM."—Job 25: 6.

"The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, WHO ONLY HATH IMMORTALITY."—1 Tim. 6: 16.

MAN'S WORD.—"A *never dying soul* to save,
And *fit* it for the sky."
[*Charles Wesley.*

GOD'S WORD.—"The SOUL that sinneth IT shall DIE."—Ezek. 18: 4.

"He spared not their SOULS from DEATH, but gave their lives over to the pestilence."—Ps. 78: 50. "The wages of sin is DEATH."—Rom. 6: 23.

MAN'S WORD.—"Death disengages the Soul from the trammels of the Body, and gives expansion to its powers.——All those passions and propensities which belong to the Body will, of course, accompany it to the silence of the grave; but all that belongs to the Soul, as ANGER, MALICE, REVENGE, will not only be retained in the disembodied state, but acquire greater capacity and power for action."—*Amer. Tract. Soc., Tract No.* 371.

GOD'S WORD.—"For the living know that they shall die, BUT THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANY THING, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their LOVE, and their HATRED, and their ENVY, is now PERISHED," &c.—Eccles. 9: 5–6.

"His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that VERY DAY HIS THOUGHTS PERISH."—Ps. 146: 4.

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—Ps. 115: 17.

"For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave [Heb. *Sheol*, or state of the dead,] who shall give thee thanks?"—Ps. 6: 5.

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor KNOWLEDGE, nor WISDOM, in the grave [Heb. *Sheol*] whither thou goest."—Ecc. 9: 10.

"For the grave [Heb. *Sheol*] cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living shall praise thee as I do this day."—Isa. 38: 18–19. See also Job 14: 21; Ps. 88: 10, 11, 12; Isa. 63: 16; Job 3: 11–19, and 10: 21–22; Luke 10: 24; 1 Thess. 4: 13–15.

MAN'S WORD.—"The souls of believers at death do *immediately* pass into glory."—*Methodist and Presbyterian Catechisms.*

GOD'S WORD.—"Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me AT THAT DAY; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love HIS APPEARING."—2 Tim. 4: 18.

"And WHEN THE CHIEF SHEPHERD SHALL APPEAR, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."—1 Pet. 5 : 4. See also John 6 : 40–44 ; 1 Pet. 1 : 5–13 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 12 ; Col. 3 : 4 ; Rom. 8 : 23.

MAN'S WORD.—

"He'll in a moment call thee hence,
To Heaven or down to HELL." [*Hart.*

GOD'S WORD.—"The Lord knoweth how—— to reserve the unjust UNTO THE DAY OF JUDGMENT TO BE PUNISHED.—2 Pet. 2 : 9.

"Who shall be PUNISHED with everlasting destruction——WHEN HE SHALL COME to be glorified in his saints."—2 Thess. 1 : 8–10. See also Rev. 11 : 18 ; Matt. 13 : 30 ; Mal. 4 : 1–3.

MAN'S WORD.—"Eternal redemption is to be regarded as involving an equally eternal enslavement. Heaven is only Heaven while there exists a Hell."—*Dr. Hamilton.*

"Oh miserable state of the damned! In it they utter as many blasphemies against God as the happy souls in heaven shout hallelujahs to his praise."—*Amer. Tract Soc., Tract No.* 277.

"God is therefore himself present in hell to see the punishment of these rebels against his government that it may be adequate to the infinity of their guilt; his fiery indignation kindles, and his incensed fury feeds the flame of their torment, while his powerful presence and operation maintain their being, and render all their powers most acutely sensible, thus setting the keenest edge upon their pain, and making it cut most intolerably deep. He will exert ALL HIS DIVINE ATTRIBUTES to make them as wretched through eternity as the capacity of their nature will admit."—*Benson*, the eminent Methodist Commentator.

GOD'S WORD.—"For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven ; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble ; and the day that cometh SHALL BURN THEM UP, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall LEAVE THEM NEITHER ROOT NOR BRANCH——And ye shall tread down the wicked, for THEY SHALL BE ASHES under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts."—Mal. 4 : 1–3.

"But the wicked shall PERISH, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs ; THEY SHALL CONSUME ; INTO SMOKE shall they CONSUME AWAY."—Ps. 37 : 20.

"When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be DESTROYED FOREVER."–Ps. 92 : 7.

"But the transgressors shall be DESTROYED together : the END of the Wicked shall be CUT OFF."—Ps. 37 : 38.

"What fruit had ye in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the END of those things is DEATH."—Rom. 6 : 21.

"Who [the wicked] shall be punished with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."—2 Thsss. 1 : 9.

"Behold all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded : they shall be as NOTHING : and they that strive with thee shall PERISH : they that war against thee shall be as NOTHING : and as a thing of NAUGHT."—Isa. 41 : 11–12. "They [the wicked] shall be as though they had not been."—Obadiah 16.

See also Ezek. 33 : 11 ; Ps. 145 : 20 ; 101 : 8 ; 37 : 9 ; Prov. 13 : 13 ; 21 : 15 ; Isa. 10 : 16, 17 ; 1 : 28 ; 5 : 24 ; 33 : 11, 12 ; 57 : 16 ; Job 31 : 3 ; Zeph. 1 : 2 ; Matt. 7 : 13 ; 13 : 30 ; Rom. 6 : 23 ; 8 : 2, 6, 13 : 2 : 12–16 ; 2 Cor. 2 : 15–16 ; Gal. 6 : 8 ; Phil. 3 : 19 ; Heb. 10 : 27 ; 6 : 8 ; 1 Tim. 6 : 9 ; 2 Pet. 2 : 12.

You have here set before you Man's Word and God's Word. Which will you believe?

"Let God be true, but every man a liar." "God is not a man that he should lie." "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar."—Prov. 30 : 6. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Rev. 22 : 18. But do you not perceive a striking discrepancy between the words of men and the words of God? The contents of this tract plainly show that there have been considerable *additions* made to God's Word, and without his authority.

Reader, art thou a believer in Christ? O prize the precious volume. It contains words of *life.* Do not allow men who are "wise above what is written," to destroy its simplicity and its preciousness by obtruding their "vain traditions" in its place.

Art thou still out of Christ? O, be persuaded to come to him, that thou mayest have *life.* The precious Word of Life gives thee every encouragement to come. Delay no longer, lest the dark night of an eternal death engulf thee in its awful gloom.

From M. Batchelor, Pownal, Vt.

BRO. STORRS—I hear you have been made to feel the uncertainty of all earthly good. I send inclosed $2, to help print the Six Sermons. I cannot consent to have them die, for they have opened the eyes of thousands to see that man is mortal, and an unholy mortal ; and that immortality can only be found in Christ ; and that the sinner, rejecting Christ, must die, become extinct, as the fruit of his own folly in believing the devil rather than God. I rejoice in the truth taught in the Six Sermons ; and the time is soon coming when sin and sorrow will cease in all God's universe. My whole being says, Amen.

The Lord is still blessing us here. The truth is triumphing over the unbelief of the human heart. Many have submitted, and learned that God is a God of love ; but it makes the enemy war. I have labored here going on eleven years, and we have had three precious revivals in the time ; but many of those brought in have moved away, which keeps our number small. We have had to labor against wind and tide. With two or three exceptions the ministry all around have thrown their influence against the truth I have preached ; but, to the praise of God's grace we can say, truth has lived and spread abroad. I have felt of late that I had a claim on God for help. I have endeavored to show that God is love, and that His love will shine in the execution of the last judgment on the

wicked, not by giving them everlasting life in misery, but as He had offered them life in Christ, and they having refused it, benevolence lets them die. God is love. Amen. I feel God's promise is verified in my experience, as thy day is thy strength shall be. I am yours in hope of life in Christ.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MAY 15, 1854.

From Professor Mattison.

NEW YORK, April 23, 1854.

GEO. STORRS: *Dear Sir*:—In looking over your strictures upon my Sermons on Immortality, it has occured to me that a better method of discussing the subject involved might be adopted. While I accord to your reporter and to yourself a desire to state my position fairly, if not fully, I think you will admit that few reporters can do justice to an extemporaneous speaker, and especially to a Methodist preacher. With their best efforts they will give but a poor idea of his discourse, especially if it be argumentative or metaphysical. So in the present case: your reporter has done the best he could, doubtless, but I am not fairly before you in the notes you are reviewing, and in some instances a man of straw is there instead of "Prof. M."

Allow me, therefore, to suggest that instead of wasting your strength upon the necessarily imperfect notes of your reporter, my positions and arguments be placed before your readers over my own signature in your columns, and that *then* you proceed to disprove them if you can. I shall then be tangibly in your hands, and there can be no misapprehension or dodging.

I am ready to take the affirmative of the question—

DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT THE SOUL OF MAN HAS A CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE, SEPARATE FROM THE BODY, BETWEEN DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION?

I affirm that they do; you say they do not. I think I can prove it; you think I cannot. Let us discuss it, then.

This question involves the prior question, namely, *whether man has a soul essentially different from his physical organization*—the point at which you would wish to begin—but the main question upon which all side issues must concentrate is the one I propose to discuss.

Should you agree with me that this is a preferable mode of conducting the discussion, and accept my proposal, my first argument shall be furnished for your next number.

Very respectfully, H. MATTISON.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We have had several friendly interviews with Prof. Mattison, and wish to be as accommodating as possible; but we stated to him *distinctly* if we went into a discussion we should insist upon the previous question being settled at the outset, viz.:—

Does the Bible teach that the creature man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a superadded entity called the soul?

Till this question is settled, it seems to us it would be arguing upon assumed premises, and hence the discussion would be attended with no certain results. It cannot satisfy an inquiring mind to have Prof. M. and ourself spend our strength till we know what it is about. On the question, as we have stated it, *we take the negative* The Prof. says his "question *involves*" this "prior" one. If he is willing to *affirm* this *prior* one, our columns are open for him to proceed, and we shall be happy to have him do so.

When that question is settled—if the Prof. succeeds in establishing the *affirmative*—the next will be—

Does the Bible teach that the soul is immortal—not liable to die, or, *to lose all life and consciousness.*

If these two questions can be settled *affirmatively*, then the Prof.'s question follows naturally and will be easy of solution, and shorten the discussion materially.

Now if Br. Mattison wishes to take up the subject from the root, and settle it forever, here is an opportunity to make the trial, and do good to men.

We defer further remarks on the Reported Sermons of Prof. M. till we see if he assents to our conditions of discussion, for if he does it is unnecessary to finish our Review of his reported discourses, as the same ground may have to be traveled over in the discussion.

NOT SO SHORT LIVED.—Prof. Mattison, as we have before noticed, said that the immortality of the soul had not been called in question since the days of our Saviour till within the last ten years. We have shown that to be a mistake. Since our remarks on that point DR. BARLOW, of this city, has put into our hands a work entitled "LEVIATHAN, or the Matter, Form, and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiastical and Civil. By Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury! Printed in London 1651."

This author says, p. 244—"Nor can the name of *second death*, be applied to those that can never die but once: and though in metaphorical speech, a calamitous life everlasting, may be called an

everlasting death, yet it cannot well be understood of a Second Death." Again, in speaking of the "everlasting fire," and "unquenchable fire," he saith, p. 245—"But it cannot thence be inferred, that he who shall be cast into that fire, or be tormented with those torments, shall endure and resist them so as to be eternally burnt, and tortured, and yet never be destroyed, nor die." On same page, in speaking of the *places* in Scripture where men are said to be cast into everlasting fire, &c., he says, "I find none that affirm there shall be an Eternal Life therein of any individual person; but, on the contrary, an everlasting death, which is the second death. * * * It is evident there is to be a Second Death of every one that shall be condemned at the day of Judgment, after which he shall die no more." Again this author speaks as follows, page 339:

Another general error is from the misinterpretation of the words *Eternal Life, Everlasting Death*, and the *Second Death*. For though we read plainly, in Holy Scripture, that God created Adam in an estate of living forever—which was conditional, that is to say, if he disobeyed not his commandment—which was not essential to human nature, but consequent to the virtue of the Tree of Life; whereof he had liberty to eat, as long as he had not sinned; and that he was thrust out of Paradise after he had sinned, lest he should eat thereof, and live for ever; and that Christ's passion is a discharge of sin to all that believe on him; and by consequence a restitution of eternal life to all the faithful and to them only: yet the doctrine is now, and hath been a long time, far otherwise; namely, that every man hath Eternity of Life by Nature, inasmuch as his *soul* is Immortal:—so that the flaming sword at the entrance of Paradise, though it hinder a man from coming to the Tree of Life, hinders him not from the immortality which God took from him for his sin; nor makes him to need the sacrificing of Christ, for the recovering of the same; and consequently, not only the faithful and righteous, but also the wicked and the heathen, shall enjoy eternal life, without any death at all; much less a second and everlasting death. To salve this, it is said, that by *second* and *everlasting death*, is meant a second, and everlasting life, but in *torments*—a figure never used, but in this very case—all which doctrine is founded only on some of the obscurer places of the New Testament; which, nevertheless, the whole scope of the Scripture considered, are clear enough in a different sense, and unnecessary to the Christian faith:—for supposing that when a man dies there remaineth nothing of him but his carcass, cannot God, that raised inanimated dust and clay into a living creature by his word, as easily raise a dead carcass to life again, and continue him alive for ever, or make him die again, by another word? The *soul*, in Scripture, signifieth always, either the *life* or the living creature; and the body and soul jointly, the *body alive*. In the first day of creation God said, Let the waters produce *reptilæ animæ viventis*, the creeping thing that hath in it a *living soul*—the English translate it, *that hath life:* and again, God created great whales, and *omnem animam viventem*—which in the English is, *every living creature:* and likewise of man, God made him of the dust of the earth, and breathed in his face the breath of life, and *factus est Homo in animam viventem*, that is, and *Man was made a living creature:* and after Noah came out of the ark, God saith, He will no more smite *omnem animam viventem*, that is, *every living creautre:* and Deut. 12: 23, Eat not the *blood*, for the *blood* is the *soul*, that is, *the life*. From which places, if by *soul* were meant a *substance incorporeal*, with an existence separated from the body, it might as well be inferred of any other living creature as of man. But that the souls of the faithful are, not of their own nature, but by God's special grace, to remain in their bodies, from the resurrection to all eternity, I have already [I think] sufficiently proved out of the Scriptures, in the 38th chapter; and for the places of the New Testament where it is said that any man shall be cast body and soul into *hell-fire*, it is no more than body and life, that is to say, they shall be cast alive into the perpetual fire of *Gehenna*.

This window it is that gives entrance to the dark doctrine first, of Eternal Torments, and afterwards of Purgatory; and consequently of the walking abroad, especially in places consecrated, solitary or dark, of the ghosts of men deceased; and thereby to the pretences of exorcisme and conjuration of phantasmes; as also of invocation of men dead, and to the doctrine of indulgences—that is to say, of exemption, for a time or for ever, from the fire of purgatory, wherein these incorporeal substances are pretended by burning to be cleansed and made fit for heaven. For men being generally possessed before the time of our Savior, by contagion of the Dæmonology of the Greeks, of an opinion that the souls of men were substances distinct from their bodies, and therefore that when the body was dead, the soul of every man, whether godly or wicked, must subsist somewhere by virtue of its own nature, without acknowledging therein any supernatural gift of gods. The doctors of the church doubted a long time what was the place which they were to abide in till they should be re-united to their bodies in the resurrection; supposing, for awhile, they lay under the altars: but afterward the Church of Rome found it more profitable to build for them this place of purgatory, which by some other churches in this later age has been demolished.

Pages 343–4, on the Immortality of Man's Soul not proved by Scripture to be of nature, but of grace, he speaks thus:—

To prove that the soul separated from the body liveth eternally, not only the souls of the elect, by especial grace and restoration of the eternal life which Adam lost by sin, and our Saviour restored by the sacrifice of himself; to the faithful, but also the souls of reprobates, as a property naturally consequent to the essence of mankind, without other grace of God but that which is universally given to all mankind; there are divers places which, at the first sight, seem sufficiently to serve the turn:

but such, as when I compare them with that which I have before [Chapter 38] alledged out of the 14th of Job, seem to me much more subject to a divers interpretation, than the words of Job.

And first there are the words of Solomon [Ecc. 12 : 7], "Then shall the dust return to dust, as it was, and the spirit shall return to God that gave it." Which may bear well enough [if there be no other text directly against it] this interpretation, that God only knows [but man not] what becomes of a man's spirit when he expireth. And the same Solomon, in the same book [Chap. 3 : 20, 21], delivereth the same sentence in the same sense I have given it: his words are, "All go [man and beast] to the same place; all are of the dust, and all return to dust again; who knoweth that the spirit of man goeth upward, and that the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" That is, none knows but God. Nor is it an unusual phrase to say of things we understand not, God knows what, and God knows where. That of Gen. 5 : 24, "Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him:" which is expounded Heb. 11 : 5, "He was translated that he should not die; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God;" making as much for the immortality of the body as of the soul, proveth that this his translation was peculiar to them that please God, not common to them with the wicked, and depending on grace, not on nature. But on the contrary, what interpretation shall we give besides the literal sense of the words of Solomon, Ecc. 3 : 19, "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath [one spirit]: so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity." By the literal sense here is no natural immortality of the soul: nor yet any repugnancy with the life eternal which the elect shall enjoy by grace. And again, [chap. 4 : 3], "Better is he that hath not yet been, than both they;" that is, than they that live, or have lived; which, if the soul of all them that have lived were immmortal, were a hard saying; for then to have an immortal soul were worse than to have no soul at all. And again, [chap. 9 : 5], "The living know they shall die, but the dead know not any thing;" that is, naturally, and before the resurrection of the body.

Another place which seems to make for a natural immortality of the soul, is that where our Savior saith that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are living: but this is spoken of the promise of God, and of their certitude to rise again, not of a life then actual; and in the same sense that God said to Adam, that on the day he should eat of the forbidden fruit, he should certainly die; from that time forward he was a dead man by sentence, but not by execution, till almost a thousand years after. So Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were alive by promise, then, when Christ spake; but are not actually till the resurrection. And the history of Dives and Lazarus make nothing against this, if we take it [as it is] for a parable.

Thus the doctrine of immortality being of grace, and conferred only on the righteous at the resurrection, is more than "ten years" old; yea, more than two hundred. We may give further extracts from the LEVIATHAN hereafter.

THE POPE'S BULLS.—A correspondent of the *Due West Telescope*, in an article on the waning of Popery, says, "Of late the Pope's Bulls are of the moily (no-horn) breed, and are consequently unable to *gore* as formerly, and in fact so *lean*, like Pharaoh's, that they can scarcely *butt!*"

Our friend HURLY, editor of the *Irish Evangelist*, of this city, when he receives one of these papistical missiles calls it "*A Calf.*" His bold exposure of Romanism has called forth a number of these *calves*.

We have received "*a calf*" lately, from some of those *lovers of darkness*. The following extract may serve to show how sincerely they wish *us dead* if we will not leave off to send death into their purgatorial system, built on the unscriptural doctrine of man's natural immortality; and because we venture to challenge an examination of the Bible against Traditions. This "*calf*" cost us *seven cents*, in postage. Certainly that is a *cheap calf!* Our readers perhaps will think it is more than it is worth. May be so, but we cannot tell what may come of it yet. It seems to be an intimation that if we do not die at his *blairing* we may expect to go in some other popish way. We have only to say, "If the Lord will." He is our keeper; and if these calf-makers can gain his consent to accomplish their purpose, to put down those who defend the Bible against the traditions of men, then let them work till their "perdition" comes. With his mouth wide open the *calf* speaks thus:—

"God forbid the devil to publish the Bible, and corrupt the texts by turning into dark speech, and pleasing speeches, and good words, to seduce the hearts of innocents. This is the way you defend the Bible against tradition. You publish the Bible contrary to the spirit of God. You would not publish that which are a restraint on your passions and yourself—the terrible words in the Bible. You would not suffer the word of God to chastise and judge your sins, hypocrisy and bigotry, and all your vices. You put all these aside, that it may not hurt your passions. This is the Bible which proceedings against Tradition. Blind guides! how can you flee from the wrath of God, which may fall upon you! Why will you not judge yourselves in this world, and confess your sins to the ministers of God in this world, before you die? Beware of flattery and presumption, or you will be lost for eternity. You will die in a moment after you read this letter! Terrible moment! Delay not one minute. Go quick! or your conscience accuses you before God for neglect

of your salvation, and trust in your strength and flattery. If you deny the confession and the church of God! God will appear to you horribly and speedily, for a most severe judgment against heresy and schism. Go to the Roman Catholic Church and confess all your sins sincerely before you die this day! and let the priest give you instructions before you be baptized and be communicated. Beware of the devil's delusion, or the death overtake you! THEOCRAT.

From Br. Grew, Philadelphia.

BR. STORRS—I have sympathised with you, beloved, in your recent trial of holy faith. "Whomsoever the Lord loveth he chasteneth." I inclose a donation to aid a little in your good work. "My God shall supply all your need, according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus." "The earth is the Lord's and the cattle on a thousand hills."

I notice with pleasure that you "do not endorse every expression in the articles of Br. Ham, and perhaps may not agree with him in all his conclusions." I pray God to unite us in his own holy and immutable truth, relative to the one great offering by which the Redeemer "hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10 : 14.

You object to that truly absurd and unscriptural notion of the atonement which represents it as "*paying* our debts," and excluding our Father's forgiving love, and, in immediate connection, remark, "We are glad that Br. Grew is evidently modifying his views on the subject; for he now says, that Christ's death 'was *vicarious* in *some sense.*'" When, dear bro., did I *ever* say or write any thing different from this? The reader might suppose from your remark that I had heretofore given some sanction to the preposterous sentiment above stated. If you can quote any thing from my writings which implies it, I will most cordially unite with you in its repudiation.

But, dear bro., in avoiding one error we must be careful that we do not dash to pieces on another. To divest the offering of the Son of God of its vicarious and governmental character, in the definite and unambiguous manner which Mr. Ham has done, may be a shipwreck of Christian faith no less fatal than to divest it of forgiving mercy; for it is no less important that our Father should be "the JUST God," than that he should be "the Savior." It is the glory of this salvation, into which "the angels desire to look," and which shall make the "new earth" resound with the grateful hallelujahs of ransomed sinners; that, in it, "mercy and truth have met together, righteousness and peace have embraced each other." See Rom. 3 : 25, 26.

I assure Mr. Ham of my grateful appreciation of his very kind remarks relative to my manner of conducting "religious controversy." May divine grace ever influence us to speak and write "the truth in love." "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." Had I indulged it in the present case I should have found my reprehension in the example of my courteous friend.

Far be it from me to present the shade of an intimation that our friend does not most sincerely consider that his views are in accordance with the teaching of the Scriptures. If "the remark contained in No. 4" fairly implies any thing more than what I intended to express, viz. that I cannot conceive how the views advanced can be reconciled with the divine testimony, I wish *now* to "withdraw" it. I will give an example. I cannot possibly conceive how the intelligent writer can reconcile the affirmation, that "the death of Christ was not designed for any purpose connected with God's righteous government," with Rom. 3 : 25, 26. Whatever may be said of "the evangelic history," I ask our dear friend to sit down once more to the perusal of this passage, and see if he can rise up having "failed to discover the faintest traces of a judicial character in the crucifixion of Christ."

My respected friend asks me to oblige him by "withholding [my] judgment" until the whole series of papers are before me, and does "not think that I am in a fair position to judge of [his] theory." May I humbly ask why not, when I waited until a number of articles appeared, containing *numerous plain, definite* affirmations, with confirming illustrations, all combining to exclude everything of a *judicial* character from the Cross, before I took up my pen?

My heart will rejoice, for the truth's sake, and for the sake of our respected friend, if, on a review of the subject, he shall perceive that his position on this important "doctrine of the Lord" is untenable. I rejoice that notwithstanding, p. 85 Vol. 9, it is affirmed that the Cross, "although foreseen by God, was not demanded and planned by Him;" Mr. Ham now writes, "Let not my friend Mr. Grew suppose that I deny there was any *determinate counsel* and foreknowledge of God in the circumstance of Christ's death." [The italicising is mine.] Permit me to ask, if "*determinate counsel*" does not imply being "demanded and planned?"

As you prefer short articles for your valuable periodical, I hope the present course may be continued, especially as I neither have presumed, or will in future presume, to oppose the divine testi-

mony to any expression of our respected friend which is not definite and plain. I will study brevity, and occupy a small space in your columns, compared with that of the articles reviewed. Your noble assurance of encouraging free discussion for the manifestation of the truth, induces me to hope that the few short articles I shall offer, for the consideration of your readers, will be admitted.

Yours, in Christian love.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We are glad to find Br. Grew disclaiming the idea that Christ died for us in the "sense of *paying* our debts." We were under the impression that he had held that view, but are happy to find he disclaims that "prepostterous sentiment."

THE SPIRIT OF HUMAN DEVOTION.

It will at once be admitted by all who have paid the slightest attention to the subject, that intercourse between man and his Maker necessarily demands that the worshipper draw near the Being worshipped in a proper frame of mind—with feelings becoming the awful solemnity and importance of the occasion. Such a state of mind can only be maintained by a clear perception of the relation which Jehovah assumes while listening to the praises and supplications of his people. And what is that position? Is it the position of incomprehensible Deity? Do the fallen sons of earth, while presenting their petitions before the Most High, require to view him in all the matchless glory and majesty of his supreme and regal power? Alas! alas! were that the case, how could we—sinners of the human race, come before God? The very thought of such a meeting would so fill us with terror and confusion, as to destroy all power of utterance, and effectually prevent any intercourse between us and the object of adoration. But—blessed be his name—we are authorized to approach him in a very different manner—to regard him with feelings, not of terror, but of confidential love. He meets with his people in the relation of a Father, and authorizes them to address him as such. "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven."

It is by forgetting this truth, that a certain class of minds run into an error of the most prejudicial character, we mean, the error of seeking to dissociate themselves from terrestrial objects, while endeavoring to worship the Almighty. They imagine that in order to worship him acceptably they must, in spirit, enter the highest heavens, and in full view of the celestial throne, around which the seraphim with veiled face and feet, cease not to cry one to another, "Holy! holy! holy! is the Lord of Hosts, the whole earth is full of his glory," and there present their petitions. These devotional enthusiasts think they have only prayed acceptably, when they have obtained some undefinable and mysterious view of the "Invisible God;" and their great end in prayer is not so much to have their requests granted, as to have their feelings excited, and when such sensations fail to be produced, they sink down in despondency and sullenness, complaining that the Lord has hid his face.

All attempts to form adequate notions of the "Invisible God" must prove fruitless and vain. The distance between him and the highest order of his creatures is necessarily great—beyond all comprehension, how much further removed are we, who "are of yesterday and know nothing"—nothing, comparatively, of the appearances around us, and contemporary with ourselves, much less of the "things unseen." Jehovah has drawn an impenetrable veil between us and the glories of the upper sanctuary; and all attempts to pierce that veil are not only fruitless, but tend more than ever to obscure our vision. Any one who, even for a few moments, tries to form an idea of the duration, immensity, or power of the Deity, shall find his notions of the Infinite grow more dark and confused than before, and, should he continue the pursuit, speedily find himself lost in the transcending glories of "light ineffable." God has, indeed, favored us with some strikng manifestations of his glorious majesty, and yet these are but mere and occasional glimpses; and any light they reflect on our minds, only discovers to us our own insignificance, and the impassable distance between us and the Being we adore. 'Tis perhaps for this reason that God has fixed the scene of our worship on earth amid terrestial objects; and condescended to place himself within the centre of human affections. He does not require us, even in spirit, to enter the "place where his honor dwelleth," and present our petitions there; but hiding from our sight he glories of the upper sanctuay, he, in his infinite condescension, "dwells as a father in the homes of earth."

But not only does the devout worshipper of God not require to ascend the regions of spirituality and celestial light to present his supplications before the Most High, inasmuch as God comes down to him; but he is required to possess the very humblest character himself. It is not with men of high thoughts that Jehovah deigns to dwell, it is only with the "humble and contrite." It is not as sages and philosophers that the people of God pour out their hearts' desires to their "Father in heaven," but as poor and needy beings, entirely dependant on him for every blessing they possess, or desire to obtain. If he stoops to hear their cry with a father's care, they must approach him with the helplessness and simplicity of children.

The Lord not only condescends to listen to his people's prayers as a father, he even authorizes us to address him as if he possessed like feelings with ourelves; to tell him all our wants in our common language, as to one related to us by the ties of human sympathy; yea, to plead with him, and ply him with motives, as if he required to be influenced by arguments. This is evident from many instances of acceptable prayer, recorded for our benefit and example in the Holy Scriptnres. Witness that striking instance mentioned in Exodus xxxii. 11-14, where we find Moses interceding on behoof of the rebellious Israelites in the following terms: "Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people which thou

hast brought out of the land of Egypt with great power and a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn thou away thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine ownself, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever. *And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people.*"

It is plain, that the worship of God is altogether adapted to the condition of the worshipper. The creature is not required to adapt itself to the Creator, but the Creator stoops to the humble condition of the creature. Thus the conduct of God to those who worship him, instead of countenancing the vague and wild notions of dreamy enthusiasts, who seek to worship God in a manner above and foreign to their nature, tends rather to localize our ideas, and confine our devout affections to the circle of earthly associations.

But it must be confessed, that some have a tendency to err in a contrary direction, abusing the Divine condescension by a wanton and irreverent mode of addressing the Supreme Jehovah. Often have we felt shocked and disgusted at the familiarity and irreverence manifested by such persons while presenting their desires to the Most High. They appeared to have forgotten that, while the Almighty condescends to listen to his people's prayers, and admit them to his presence on terms of friendship, it is only in the character of suppliants, not of companions; it is only for the purpose of hearing their requests, not that he might gratify their talkative propensities. Such indecorous worshippers justly incur the complaint, "Thou thoughtest I was altogether such an one as thyself." The conditions on which acceptable prayer is presented while encouraging the utmost freedom and confidence in the suppliant, gives no countenance whatever to an irreverent business-like familiarity; but, on the contrary, fill the mind of the petitioner with the deepest self-abasement, and the profoundest reverence towards the Most High. This must appear evident if we reflect that the medium of approach to the throne of grace is by a MEDIATOR. "No man," says Jesus, "cometh unto the Father but by me." It is in his name that all our petitions must be presented,—for his sake any blessing can be received by us. Thus, while the believer is encouraged to "draw near, in the full assurance of faith," he is at the same time kept in remembrance of his own worthlessness and vileness; and the only feelings that can possess his mind, regarding himself, are those of shame, guilt, and contrition. If he can only approach God through a Mediator, and obtain favors in his name, then he is himself destitute of all merit and claim on the Divine goodness; and he stands a beggar at the fountain of blessing: a beggar! nay, not so high, but a guilty one in the sight of God, and begs for mercy in the name of another.

The true spirit of human devotion is thus at utter variance with that of the dreamy enthusiast who affects to meet God in the air, and worship him with the feelings not of a human, but of an angelic nature, and alike opposed to the familiarities of common companionship. It is, in a word, a spirit of artless simplicity and authorized earnestness—united with self-abhorrence, shame, filial gratitude, and reverential awe.—*Moncrieff's Exp'r.*

From Rufus Wendell, Canajoharie, N. Y.
May 2, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—My interest in the Immortality question suffers no abatement. I am *more* than pleased with the EXAMINER and the manner in which it is conducted. Continue your review of Br. Mattison, as you may have opportunity; it must do good. What can be done, or, rather, what will it be necessary for us to do to induce you to publish the EXAMINER, next year, *weekly*, or semi-monthly in *double* its present size? One or the other of these changes I, for one, am extremely anxious to have you make, if the requisite means can be raised, both in donations and paying subscribers. In case of such a move, the subscription should be raised to $2. Most cheerfully would I do all I could to promote the object to which I am thus early calling your attention. You know best what the prospect of success would be should the enterprize be laid before your readers. Your relation to the *Life and Death question*, in this country, gives you facilities for spreading light upon it, if the means are furnished, that no other man possesses. And it appears to me that you can do more good by publishing the EXAMINER, and scattering it over the land, than in any other way. These are a *few* of my thoughts on the subject.

—

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We have given place to Br. Wendell's suggestion about the *weekly* issue of the EXAMINER next year, &c., and would simply say, we have no will about it, and certainly feel no anxiety to increase our present burdens. We mean to strive, through grace, to do the work which God in His providence marks out for us; we have no choice, only that His will be done. If that is for us to go into retirement, we trust not to murmur; though active exertion is more pleasing, if it can be performed to the benefit of man.

We commenced the EXAMINER in 1842—issuing it occasionally—at our own expense, mainly, till 1847, when we commenced its regular *monthly* issue at fifty cents per year. At that price it could not be sustained except by donations. In 1850, the subscripion price was increased to $1. This sum for '50 and '51, did little more than pay the printer. The two following years, *viz.*: 52 and '53, the paper gave us about $200 per year, above paying the printer's bill. The present year we commenced it semi-monthly, without increasing the price. But we commenced it thus before the *thousand* subscribers were received, which we

stated, last year, would be necessary to meet the expenses of the paper; not allowing in that estimate anything for our own labor. Up to the present date, however, we have received only about $800 from subscribers. So far from the EXAMINER giving us any pecuniary support this year, from present appearances, it is likely to involve us in debt. Hence the policy of attempting to publish *weekly* is questionable; but we thought best to let Br. Wendell speak his mind on the subject for future consideration among the friends of the BIBLE EXAMINER.

From Polly G. Pitts, Union, Wis.

Br. Storrs.—The BIBLE EXAMINER comes to us a very welcome messenger; and our prayer is, that the Lord will hold you up and increase your trust and confidence in Him, and His glorious promises, seven-fold. That you may realize the promise of the Lord, in Isaiah, when he said, "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." No, my brother, neither floods or flames can destroy our hidden life. Our life that is hid with Christ, in God. And when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, may you, my brother, and this poor unworthy writer, with all the sanctified, appear with Him in glory. It is a time of trial to the true Israel of God; and may He grant us strength to stand firmly for His word.

There is a few lines, in a book called the Millennium that I have often thought of: it is ascribed to the devil, as saying to his angels, when he sent them forth to oppose the everlasting gospel. He says:

"But there are some—as there has always been,
And still will be, to the end of time—who, bold
And energetic; zealous, fully clad
In sacred vestments from above, and arm'd
Complete in panoply, long since approv'd,
Such as Messiad furnishes, from the
Great armory of truth, which ancient seers
And patriarchs put on;—there will be some
Of this invulnerable set, who will
Despise the sick'ning flattery of man,
And labor only that they stand approv'd
Of him that sent them forth to preach the word.
Such men as these, engaged with all the heart
And all the soul, will prove inflexible,
And ne'er can we expect to turn their feet
From the highway of truth. The world, with all
Its baits, can ne'er allure, nor dangers fright
Them from the course, marked out in sacred writ,
For those who preach the word. No love of gain
Impels them to the work. The naked truth
Is all that they declare. No fear of man
Diverts them from their course. Their faces, like
A flint, are set heavenward. Their only trust
Is in the living God. These we can ne'er
Annoy; but still we may traduce, revile,
Defame, asperse, and every means employ,
To render them obnoxious to the world."

I remember that you have said in time past, "Pray for me." I do pray that you may be one of this blessed number, and for the joy that is set before you [life through Christ] that you may endure the cross, despise the shame, overcome, and sit down with our Saviour on His throne.

The following are a few precious lines, from a leaf, more than a hundred years old;

"Lord; what is man? Original dust; engendered in sin, brought forth in sorrow, helpless in his infancy, extravagantly wild in his youth, mad in his manhood, decripted in his age; his first voice moves pity, his last commands grief. Nature clothes the beasts with hair, the birds with feathers, the fishes with scales, but man is born naked, his hands cannot handle, his feet cannot walk, nor his eyes see aright: vain are his desires, toys are his delight, he no sooner puts on the distinguishing character of manhood, but he burns it with wildfire's passion, stains it with abominable pride, or contaminates it with debauchery. Lord, what is man? A dung-hill blanched with snow—a make-game for fortune—a mark for malice—a butt for envy; if poor, despised; if rich, flattered; if simple, derided; if prudent, mistrusted. His beauty is but a flower—his wit a flash—his wisdom folly—his art, imperfection—his glory, a blaze—his life, a span—himself, a bubble. He is born crying, lives laughing, dies groaning.

"'Who then to vain mortality would trust
Who is crushed before the moth, whose dwelling is
in dust."

The light is spreading slowly in Wisconsin. The Baptist minister in Union has to fight the truth on the life theme, to keep his flock easy. But He that is higher than the highest regardeth, and there be higher than they. May the Lord preserve us all blameless unto His coming and kingdom, is the prayer of your unworthy sister.

From R. P. Grant, Port Hope, C. W.

Br. Storrs.—I was exceedingly sorry to hear of your loss by fire; for I was quite sure you had nothing to spare. I suppose I have lost three times as much in another way of late, therefore I feel incapable of assisting you much, but as a proof of my desire, I enclose you one dollar, and also another for a new subscriber for your paper.

Yours, still looking for the blessed hope.

From Jonas Notestine, Canann, Ohio.

Br. Storrs.—Your Six Sermons have opened the way, and have given me more real pleasure than the world ever had or can. I love the Bible, and its author too more at this time than I ever did before. I wish those Sermons and Bible vs. Tradition could be placed in Wooster for sale. I will buy some of them, if sent to Wooster, and give them away, that the truth may be known, and God's name glorified.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We cannot send out works *on sale;* our funds will not permit, and then it is usually a loss and damage to us to do it. We would be glad to see the works scattered, and hope it will be done.

From Geo. Hill, Meredith, N. Y.

Br. Storrs.—I feel much interest in the BIBLE EXAMINER, and hope to contribute to its pages, and assist to extend its circulation. My sympathy has been with you in your loss, and in your prosperity: for although you have met with a loss by fire, you seem to prosper in your labor of love.

Christianity has for its doctrine the principal of love. The gospel brought glad tidings of good will to man, and produceth good will among men. The righteous are blessed because they *hear* the *word* of *God* and keep it. It is from doing good, by deeds of charity, that we are accounted worthy to inherit the kingdom of heaven. The blessing to be conferred upon the righteous, as recorded in Math. 25th, is because they *practiced* brotherly love, and furnished the needy with the necessaries of life. What is more important to man than a knowledge of the truth. All those who love the truth, as it is in Christ Jesus, and assist to proclaim its teachings, will be awakened, on the resurrection morn, by the joyful sound of mercy—"Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joys of thy Lord."

From J. P. Slayton, Gorham, N. Y.

Br. Storrs..—I some time ago concluded that I had not rendered you an equivalent for your invaluable BIBLE EXAMINER, therefore, I send two dollars more, and I would gladly pay five dollars per annum for it weekly. Why can we not have it weekly? I believe the most of your subscribers would like to pay double or threble what they now pay, to have it weekly. Tryphena Metcalf sends one dollar for the EXAMINER for the present year. Irena Metcalf sends one dollar as a donation. We all send you our thanks and our best wishes for your health and prosperity in this world, and for eternal life in the world to come.

Yours in hope of immortality through Christ.

Final Report of Prov. Com.

RECEIPTS since Report of Jan. 15: From a friend in Williamsburgh 3, friend in Buffalo $2. By J. Blain—friends, Hartford, Ct. $37; friends, Springfield, Mass. $11; friends in Worcester $16, friends in East Boston $6.50, friends in Plymouth $4.50, friend in Roxbury $5, friend in New Bedford $1, friend in Charlestown $2, friend in Pownal, Vt. $1; friends in New York City $7. By T. Garbutt, from friend in Lyndon, N. Y. $1; friend in Somerset $2.50, friend in Cambria $3, collection in Lewiston $3.75, friends in Lewiston $3, friend in Orangeport $1. By C. F. Sweet—from friends, Le Raysvslle, Pa. $2.15; friend in Springfield, Pa. $2; friend in South Creek, Pa. $3.50; various other collections and donations $25.15, From D. B. Salter $10. Total $153.05.

DISBURSEMENTS in same time: to Jacob Blain $59, C. F. Sweet $45.55, Thomas Garbutt $29.50, C. M. Richmond $24. Total, - - - $158 05

Total receipts for the year - - - -	$529 41
Total disbursements do. - - - - -	547 06
Treasury overdrawn, - - - - -	$17 65

The claims of all the agents employed by the *Prov. Com.*, during the year, have been met to their entire satisfaction, and fully paid, with the exception of Br. Blain. It will be seen, however, that the Treasury has been overdrawn, and the Treasurer himself bears that amount as his own responsibility, to complete paying the agents. As we have no means of knowing who have subscribed and not yet paid, it has been impossible to send out *circulars*, as we intended, to persons who had not paid their subscriptions; and we declined paying an agent a salary and traveling expenses to go over six States to *collect*, as we were persuaded such a course would not be approved by the donors to the Treasury of the *Prov. Com.* We delayed our final report in hopes to have effected a complete settlement with all the agents before publishing, but have been hindered in our attempt to accomplish that object in Br. Blain's case.

H. A. CHITTENDEN,
HENRY F. JOHNSON,
GEO. STORRS,
} Late *Prov. Com.*

AN EDITOR'S EXPERIENCE.—Dr. Lee, of the Richmond Advocate, gives the following account of his early experience as an Editor.

"We gave our readers columns of solid divinity: the paper was too dull. We culled from science, literature and art; what are you about—yours is a religious paper. We gleaned from papers of sister Churches: why, are you not editing a Methodist paper? We wrote paragraphs, they were too short; essays, they were too long; took the *via media*, readers turned right off at a cross road. We were on 'the bridge of sighs,' at the foot of 'the hill of difficulty.' Here we took our first lesson in wisdom—found out we were a fool, engaged in the Sysiphean task of pleasing that very respectable and very particular gentleman, Mr Everybody."

An Editor that undertakes to please "Mr. Everybody," will find himself always at the "foot of the hill of difficulty." Let him use his best judgment, act in the love and fear of God, and not try to do impossibilities.

STRANGE NOTION.—What is it? That the image of Daniel 2d is to be re-constructed, head and all, and thus stand up to be *smitten* "*on its feet!*" This supposed re-construction is, in fact, the *fifth* universal kingdom. It might with just as much truth be affirmed that the four beasts of Dan. 7th must all be re-constructed, as that Nebuchadnezzar's image is to be; but the prophecy saith the "*fourth* beast" is to be *slain*, &c. Daniel is equally as explicit in the 2d chapter in stating the *fourth* kingdom as the one to be *divided*; constituting the

feet and toes; and it is this fourth kingdom, or feet and toes form ofthe kingdom, that is to be smitten by the stone. To talk of the re-construction of the image of Dan. 2d, and then to strike it on its *feet*, instead of its *head*, is to us a *strange notion*.

THE TREE OF LIFE.

"*To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.*" Rev. 2: 7.

JESUS, my life, my All—bless'd SON OF GOD!
Beneath Thy verdant, Thy refreshing shade,
With calm delight I sit—IMMORTAL TREE!
Sweet to my taste is thy *life-giving* fruit:
By faith I eat, and shall for ever live.
Thy life is mine: Thine is the life in me.
I live, and yet not *I*: in me *Thou* liv'st;
And I, *because* Thou liv'st, shall never die.
Thine Essence is Eternal and DIVINE:
But wondrous Mystery! Thou to earth didst come,
Take root and grow, a tender plant unknown:
As a frail sapling, in a thirsty soil:
No comeliness in Thee, the eye beheld:
No form of beauty—nought to be desired:
So blind is man to excellence Divine:
To LOVE incarnate, so insensible.
E'en as the Father in Himself hath life,
In Thee was life—*communicable life*,
Eternal life—for sinful, mortal men.
Thou the "Green Tree" wast smitten in our stead:
Thy leaf was withered, and Thy trunk laid low;
But Thou to life didst soon again revive,
By virtue of Thine own atoning blood,
And Thine essential Immortality.
Now, in the midst of God's own Paradise,
With leaf unfading, and abundant fruit,
"The *Resurrection* and the *Life*" art Thou.
Mortals, by faith, behold Thee, and adore,
And, *by Thy fruit alone*, for ever live.
Then let me dwell by faith beneath Thy shade,
Till I, by *oneness* with Thyself, shall rise
To Thine own Paradise, IMMORTAL TREE!
Thy righteousness my title is to *life*,
My immortality—eternal life—
To thee I owe, and to Thy precious blood,
JESUS, Thou Christ, the Lord of All—"THE LIFE."

"*He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" 1 John 5: 12.

W. MORRIS.

OURSELF.—The EDITOR of the EXAMINER has preached uniformly from once to three times every Sunday since this year came in, besides all his labor in preparing matter for the paper during each week, and performing all the labor of mailing with his own hands. The labor has become more than his years and strength can endure. Necessity has compelled him either to preach less or have help in his labor about the office. He has concluded to take the latter course, and trust to the friends of the EXAMINER to sustain him in it. An additional expense of two or three hundred dollars per year will be the result of this arrangement: by it, however, he will be at liberty to go abroad more, and intends doing so. During this year, so far, his preaching has been confined to New York, Paterson, N. J., and a few other places in this vicinity.

MORE TRACTS.—The author of "An Appeal to men of Reason and Common Sense"—Br. NICHOLAS DABB—has furnished us with the manuscripts for two more Tracts, one of which we give our readers in this number of the EXAMINER, viz.: "*Man's Word* vs. *God's Word*." The other will appear in the next issue. It is entitled, "*Is this Infidelity*." These productions are well calculated to gain attention, and do good. We hope the author will continue this series of tracts; and we will issue them as fast as our means will permit. It is intended to confine each one to four pages, large 12mo., and in large type. Any person having funds which they would like to apply to such an object, can materially help in the issue. We have before said, These tracts are written by a brother who, a few months since, was a Methodist Preacher; and these are his first productions in public. May he have grace and wisdom to hold on as he has begun. The price will be 60 cts. per 100, $5 per 1,000.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER can be had, *in sheets*, for '49, '50, '51, '52, and '53, for *fifty* cents each year. Or, for $2 we will send the *whole* for those five years. We will give either year to any person who will send us *two* new subscribers, with payment in advance, for the *present year*.

Will our friends try to send us a few new subscribers, immediately? It would be a great help to us if we could have half as many more as we have now.

☞ H. L. HASTINGS' post office address is Peacedale, R. I.

☞ THOMAS GARBUTT'S post office address is North Ridge, Niagara Co., N. Y.

DONATIONS since May 1st: Reuben P. Grant $1, David Rollins $2, Dr. E. Perkins $1, M. Batcheler $2, Richard Martin $6.50, Stephen Benton $1, Irena Metcalf $1, Daniel Westervelt $5, B. J. Burnett $2.50, James B. Trevier $2, friends in Rensselear, Ind. by E. T. Harding, $5; friends in Paterson $29, Polly G. Pitts 50 cts., Henry Grew $5, F. W. and N. M. Henry $2, Parker Sawyer $3, Reuben Burroughs $2, Wm. E. Goudy $2, Daniel Davis $1, Alex. Welsh $1.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JUNE 1, 1854. NO. 11.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 130 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or. Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man*: By WM. BATHGATE."

[Continued from page 179, Vol. 8.]

In concluding our last notice of Mr. Bathgate's work, we left for the consideration of our readers a long extract, which we respectfully urge them to re-peruse, as it seems unnecessary to quote it on this occasion. The extract contains Mr. B,'s *solitary* direct argument from Scripture in behalf of universal human immortality, or rather of human souls. We remarked on the former time, "That the passage was given by Mr. Bathgate to demonstrate the immortality of the human soul, and the word *soul* is not in it!" an alarming fact for his argumentation, and one we shall carefully keep in mind. It is disgraceful, and we write this with pain, to build up a pretended argument for the immortality of the soul on a passage that has no reference, at least, direct reference, to souls of any kind. This is conduct that would not be tolerated in the ranks of science for a day, and it ought to be excluded from religious controversy.

Further, we remark, that supposing our Lord in his address to the Sadducees, when he says, "*neither can they die any more*," refers to the *whole* of the resurrected human race, this would still leave Mr. B. destitute of valid proof of human immortality. Reflect a moment, and this comes out as demonstration. Mark, then, our Master says, "neither can they die any more," and the no more death in the future is necessarily to be determined as to its meaning, by the death that has happened to the resurrected in the past; just in the same way as if one were to tell a poor man he would on no after occaion feel the want of money, he would know what, according to this promise, he was never to re-experience, by what he had endured in bye-gone days. "Neither can they die any more,"—how had they died previously? It was by death they had become fit subjects for a resurrection,—in what sense had they died? This is the piercing question,—one that we must have answered before our author can be permitted to hoist the flag of victory. Overlooking this question entirely, his deductions, no doubt, are rather plausible; but the moment it is taken into consideration, we find his great proof to be destitute of strength. His friends expected an irrefragable, heresy-defying, and heresy-demolishing argument, and lo, it can be easily manifested, there comes up again but the old *assumption* of man's immortality in a new dress, and on a new stage. Here is the evidence of this strong assertion. And for the better elucidation of it, let us suppose a man is before us after the resurrection has taken place; he consists, as Mr. B. assures us, of two parts at least,—body and soul. Now, let us further imagine this person to ask, "Am I IMMORTAL?" Mr. B. would respond, of course, "yes," and his main consideration for the questioner's satisfaction would be the words of the blessed Redeemer, "Neither can they die any more." Now, here, as already stated, we have a death spoken of which the party is supposed to have undergone, and with which he is well acquainted from experience. The death already endured is the key to the death never to be tasted afresh. Well, then, what was the ante-resurrection death? This man had died, but it is to be borne in mind that *he had never lost consciousness*, for, according to Mr. B.'s theory, his soul—substantially himself, our author being judge,—had alway been alive, and endowed with pleasing or painful experience in heaven or hell, as the case might be; in fact, as this man had only in his death been *disembodied*, expelled for the time from a fleshly tabernacle, the words "neither can they die any more," could only intimate to him at best that he will never again be *disembodied* in any after period of his new or resurrected career. He is not to die,—that is, be disembodied—any more! So Mr. B, understands death: in this sense he believes our Lord to have used the word "die," when on other occasions he referred to that event. Had our author contended for a universal resurrection to immortal existence, and freely admitted that death was not a transition to another state of conscious being, but the entire, though temporary, loss of conscious being itself, he might have argued as he has done; but understanding death to be simple disembodiment, the consolation he gives to an inquiring mind on the point in hand is utterly worthless. The resurrected person before us is supposed to inquire if he is immortal,—Mr. B. tells him, he will never be anew disembodied, and leaves him in the dark as to how long this conscious re-embodied existence shall last. The man asked bread and he has got a stone: he wished hope of unending being, and a reed that has neither length nor breadth is put into his hand. What though he shall never be disembodied, may he not cease to exist? The thing is possible,—and may not a soul go out of conscious existence *in* a body, as well as out of it? Mr. B., then, by his reply to the man's

awful query, "Am I immortal?" might just as wisely respond to him, you will never need food again,—or clothing,—you will never again be subject to diseases you bore on earth, as to say, "you cannot die anew," i, e., enter afresh on *disembodied* existence. All that may be certain, but still comes up the tremendous demand, "May I not, while embodied, cease to be?" To that question our author gives no reply. Supposing that he is sound as to the universality of the reference to the words,—"neither can they die any more;" had he accepted death in its natural and common-sense meaning,—in the meaning in which he is showing that men are to be exempt eternally from dissolution, as here affirmed in the promise, he might have gloried in being able to give such a decided and unequivocal answer to our imaginary resurrected querist; but he cannot get the benefit of a meaning in the reply of our Lord, which he does not admit to be contained in the question he is understood to be solving and settling. Can they die any more? is the question which Mr. B. understands the Savior chiefly to answer, but he uses the word die in the question, not as it is employed by Jesus, in his deliverance. The value of the Savior's words to Mr. B.'s purpose is in this, that Jesus delivers the doctrine of the deathlessness of the resurrected, and makes no reference whatever to disembodiment; whereas, but when the writer understands death as only disembodiment, all that he can reverentially imagine the Savior to promise consistently, was something in harmony with the supposed need or wish, an exemption from another disembodiment, which of course is in itself no security against entire subsequent destruction of being. He supposes Jesus to reply to a question in harmony with the popular theory as to man's dissolution, in a sense fitting to a question in accordance with our views of the human constitution and death. This cannot be allowed our author. He must be consistent, and consistency is the death of his argumentation.

We might now logically deliver over Mr. B.'s vaunted solitary argument for universal human immortality to its fate, and pass on to examine other paragraphs of his volume. But we can afford to be generous to our readers, as well as faithful to the writer. We shall consider the passage in Luke more fully, as well as some of the reasoning in this work regarding it, which has not yet attracted our notice. It is a mass of forced argumenting from first to last, and serves the purpose of showing how strained an effort is needed to give a rather plain passage a meaning which it never can contain, with a view to keep up a system of crumbling orthodoxy.

With a design to give Mr. B. the fullest advantage of his reasoning, we shall in the meantime assume that there is no invalidating weakness in the word "die," as he understands it; in other words, that the promise, "neither can they die any more," expresses the absolute idea of immortality; and now proceed for a while to determine who are those pledged with endless existence. The weakness of his argument, we have discovered, consists in this, that the Savior's declaration, so often quoted, must employ the term "die" in its natural sense, as loss of being, if it is to be of any service in the grand controvery, is man according to Scripture, an heir of immortality? and which Mr. B. asserts in the promising words, to be decided in the affirmative; and this being the sense of the word "die," when it is promised that the event will never happen again, it must be so understood in the past history of each of the resurrected, being in the history of each of them an event which has happened once when they passad into the silence of the tomb: but in this sense during the ante-resurrection period, Mr. B. does not understand death, for he holds it to be simply disembodiment involving no actual loss of conscious experience. If the death referred to by Jesus was such a death as Mr. B. understands to happen to every son of Adam when he expires, then he only promises in the post-resurrection future exemption from such a death as the parties spoken of had undergone in this state, i. e., an exemption from disembodiment. But let us suppose the death undergone to be the same as the death from which exemption is promised, i. e., literal death, or death in the sense in which the words "neither can they die any more," must be held if they are to express immortality of being, and proceed to search for an answer to the question to whom is this prospect opened up? Who are to live for ever? Mr. B. says *all;* we humbly think that even here he fails again, for the more natural interpretation is that which confines it to a class, viz., the righteous. The extension of the words before us to the *ungodly*, whatever they essentially import, is something almost new in the annals of interpretation, and a procedure that should have been defended by clearer reasons than those adduced before such a hazardous assertion was made. To whom, then, is the promise delivered, "neither can they die any more?"

We have tried to view the whole passage from the side of Mr. B. and his friends, but confess that the longer we have thus beheld it, the more we have been astonished at the vision of those who assert it clearly announces by its signs universal immortality. They see what we cannot find;—we suspect they discover what their theory leads them to wish may be there. The reasoning by which the passage is claimed for the popular side appears to us forced and vain. Overlooking the grand difficulty we have presented, every nerve is strung to pull it over to the help of the orthodoxy: but it stands in its own place, and we feel sure it cannot be moved. We must now quote a few sentences from Mr. B. in confirmation of what we have just declared as to the character of his reasoning; and as matter for some future observation, he says:—

"The first clause requiring elucidation is in verse 35:—'They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead,' &c. By those who say that the righteous only are meant in these words, it is maintained that the term *accounted worthy* necessarily implies that the persons entering the future world and raised from the dead, have a virtuous moral character, on account of which the destiny *here mentioned* is awarded, or that entrance on the future world, and the resurrection from the dead, are peculiar favors conferred on the good. The phrase *accounted worthy*, does not necessarily bind us to think either of moral desert or moral fitness. Evidently none but God can judge as to the pro-

priety of drawing out men's lives beyond the present scene. May not God deem the human race, as such, apart from virtuous features of moral character, worthy of the destiny here indicated? We think he does. So far as human knowledge extends, God has not deemed the brute creation worthy of a resurrection, or future life. But that he has deemed the human body worthy of a resurrection, and the human soul worthy of a future life, irrespective of the moral condition of the departed, is matter of no revelation. 'There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.' 'The hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.' Most explicitly do those verses teach us that God shall deem it proper to summon all bodies from the grave, and all souls to the future world. Thus we are told *who* shall be deemed worthy of such a destiny. The ground of the destiny of *a* resurrection, or a future life, is not stated. Probably it lies in the nature of man, as a rational and responsible being. There is then the clearest evidence that all men shall be raised from the dead, and shall enter the great futurity. Next follows the emphatic deliverance, that all the resuscitated,—all those who enter the future world, are immortal.—'Neither can they die any any more.' "—pp. 65, 66.

There is a point in the passage from Luke which Mr. B. has entirely neglected, and one which it is not convenient for truth or our argument that it should be ignored. This is it; the Savior's words, "the resurrection from the dead," are more literally, the resurrection *from among the dead*. It is the same resurrection that Paul was striving to obtain. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,"—Philippians 3: 2. The verse, as it stands thus, is only fitted to perplex ordinary readers, since they will naturally wonder what was the design of any striving on Paul's part to reach what, on common christian consent, he was sure of, whether he strove for it or no,—a resurrection from the dead. The Greek is plain; it is a resurrection *from among* the dead he was laboring to attain unto. He wanted to rise in the first awakening; not to sleep on till the wicked, the heirs of condemnation, would be summoned from the dust. It was the resurrection here spoken of by the Savior that the Apostle was thristing for, and no wonder, since its heirs are to die no more, and to be as the angels of God in heaven. The very language of the Savior, then, obviously limits the reference in the promise "neither can they die any more," to those who have had, because they were deemed worthy of it, a resurrection out from among the dead, or the corpses. Moreover, the remarks on the words, "they which shall be accounted worthy," we deem very poor and far-fetched. What Mr. White says in his reply to the Rev. John Hinton's criticism on this passage, is worthy of perusal: "Mr. Hinton," says Mr. White, "is obliged by the exigencies of his argument, to attempt to get rid of the idea of moral desert or holy character, which is suggested by the verb of which the words (be accounted worthy) are a translation. His attempt appears to me, if I may say so without offence, to be a signal failure; for it is notorious that the *most obvious* rendering of the verb, and of the whole phrase, does involve the notion of peculiar personal qualification. While, therefore, he professes himself content to follow the critical guidance of Schleusner (who seems to have shared in the author's desire to discover the immortality of mankind in the passage before us), and of the elegant Castalio, I must profess myself content to follow the guidance of nearly all critics and commentators of chief repute, and of our venerable translators, re-echoing the rendering of Wicliff, Tyndale, Cranmer, and the versions of Geneva and Rheims, in retaining the common translation of the entire passage, which indisputably supports the opinion that our Savior referred in his answer to the righteous alone. 'The exigency of the passage, and general considerations, decide its meaning.' " They who are in the eye of the Judge worthy of a resurrection from among the dead,—i.e., the first resurrection,—shall by and by come forth, and having put on incorruptibility, they shall die no more. Having striven, like Paul, for such a resurrection, it shall be their portion. With a view still further to extend the bearing of the words to the whole race, "neither can they die any more," our author handles the expressions "equal unto the angels" are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection, in a manner similar to his treatment of the phrase, "accounted worthy." To consider his expositions at great length, would not tend to edification. Equal to the angels, he makes as if it had run, all angels; whereas in another place we find it was the "angels of God in heaven," (Matt. 22: 30), to whom our Lord made reference. If there is any meaning in words, it could be no great comfort to tell the resurrected as a security of their deathlessness, that they would be equal to angels, "fallen," when they are like their leader, destined to perdition. "The children of God," being "the children of the resurrection," is another part of our Lord's speech which is plundered of beauty to serve a purpose. They are children of God, it seems, whether saints or sinners, in the same sense as we would affix to the words "we are his offspring;" being resurrected from the dead by divine power, is supposed to afford a title to this designation, analogous to that which is involved in original creation. That any person will naturally assign these cold and barren senses to the expressions under notice, we can scarcely believe; and hence there is less need for a special effort to redeem them from any injury they have sustained from the hands of a few, who have found it necessary to put forth some reckless efforts by their agency, to save a sinking theology from utter submersion.

As far as we have gone in the consideration of our Lord's reply to the question of the Sadducees, we may learn four things:—1st. That there it to be a resurrection from among the dead; 2nd. That moral worthiness is to be the ground of it; 3rd. That its heirs are not to marry, or be given in marriage; 4th. They are to die no more, for they shall be eqal to the angels of God in heaven. All these points are closely connected, and have a direct bearing on the case presented to our Lord by

his Sadducean adversaries. They proposed the question, "in the resurrection whose wife of them (i.e., of the seven brethren) is she? for seven had her to wife?" The authoritative reply is, that the resurrected he refers to, are neither to marry nor to be given in marriage; and the other points, they are to die no more,—they are to equal the angels of God in heaven, bear out the idea—dimly we grant, but still as clearly as it can now probably be made,—that a new order of things shall then be founded, and the sons of this resurrection will be differently constituted from what is found in this mortal and soulish period of the history of man. So far the Sadducees were amply replied to—there was to be no marrying, for things would be quite different in that world, or age, from what we see now. The Sadducees imagined that the resurrection would produce an entire identity with the condition of men *before death*; our Lord shows them otherwise, and turns aside a difficulty that may have sprung up and fastened itself upon his doctrine of resurrection.

At this point it may be wise to advert to another consideration that has been brought forward in favor of the universal reference of the words, "neither can they die any more." It is the very question of the Sadducees, involving all the parties who had been husbands to this daughter of Abraham, as well as the woman herself. The Sadducees say nothing about the righteous, we are told, among her husbands, they appear to make their question quite general; and the exposition of the reply of our Lord, which confines it to righteous parties, represents him, it is added, as not meeting his questioners fairly and candidly. We answer, there is no reason whatever, for supposing that the Sadducees did not refer to all the husbands, and to the woman herself as righteous characters. Indeed, in connection with what other character could they think the question they proposed, worth raising for solution? Jesus taught a resurrection, and it was his doctrine that excited their speculative curiosity. But, if it was his doctrine, then, as we believe, they must have understood him to teach, that if the righteous rose to live, the wicked ascended from the dust to die. He spoke of them as being burned in "unquenchable fire," which was just a strong manner of expressing their entire consumption in Gehenna. Here was no need then for referring to any but holy characters,—those who would gain, as he taught, the resurrection to everlasting life. And would the Sadducees understand this? We answer, the end of the wicked is as clearly taught as the doctrine of the resurrection; and we are bound to admit, that they equally apprehended both. Let it be observed, we affirm not that they approved the Savior's doctrine about the future destinies of men; all we insist upon is this, that they had as good opportunities for learning what he delivered about the end of the resurrected wicked, as about the fact that he disclosed the doctrine of a resurrection at all. When this is taken into consideration, and there is not, as far as we see, the shadow of a reason why it ought even to be questioned, the reference of Jesus in his answer, to the extent we have considered it, is to the resurrection brought forward for his consideration, viz., the resurrection of the righteous, for it was only to his doctrine regarding them, that the question, "whose wife shall she be?"—could sanely be propounded, inasmuch as the condemned could not have time for any fresh alliances like the one specified, their doom being to perish in their sins, and that without any delay. The longer we consider the passage it seems, therefore, wise, nay imperiously demanded by the necessities of the case, to restrict the reference of the grand words, "neither can they die any more," to the righteous alone.

THE CROSS—A REVIEW.

BY HENRY GREW.

Our respected friend, Mr. Ham, quotes the words of Paul, expressing his desire to "fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church." After giving Mr. Barnes' exposition of the passage, Mr. Ham affirms, "In his view they ('Christ's sufferings') were *exemplary, not* expiatory." I am assured that he will allow me to do Mr. Barnes the justice of correcting this inference. On reference to Mr. B.'s comments on Rom. 3 : 25, he will find the following plain and positive declaration:—"It means that God has publicly exhibited Jesus Christ *as a propitiatory sacrifice* for the sins of men." "In what sense," asks Mr. B., "is he declared to be a propitiation?" He answers (1) "The *main idea*, in regard to the cover of the ark, called the mercy-seat, was that of God's being *reconciled* to his people; this is the main idea in regard to the Lord Jesus, whom 'God hath set forth.' (2.) This reconciliation was effected *then* by the sprinkling of the blood on the mercy seat. Lev. 16 : 15. The same is true of the Lord Jesus—by blood. (3.) In the former case it was the blood of atonement; the offering of the bullock on the great day of atonement, that the reconciliation was effected. Lev. 16 : 17, 18. In the case of the Lord Jesus it was also by blood; by the blood of atonement. But it was by his *own* blood. This the apostle distinctly states in this verse. (4.) In the former case there was a *sacrifice*, or *expiatory* offering; and so it is in reconciliation by the Lord Jesus. In the former, the mercy-seat was the visible, declared place where God would express his reconciliation with his people. So in the latter, the offering of the Lord Jesus is the manifest and open way by which God will be reconciled to men. (5.) In the former, there was joined the idea of *a sacrifice for sin*. Lev. 16. So in the latter, and hence *the main* idea of the apostle here is to convey the idea of a sacrifice for sin; or to set forth the Lord Jesus as such a sacrifice. Hence the word "propitiation" in the original may express the idea of a *propitiatory sacrifice*, as well as the cover to the ark. This meaning accords also with its elastic meaning to denote a *propitiatory offering*, or an offering to produce reconciliation. Christ is thus represented, not *as a mercy-seat*, which would be unintelligible; but as the medium, the offering, the EXPIATION, by which reconciliation is produced between God and man."

Our friend will perceive, from the above quota-

tions, that so far from Mr. Barnes considering the sufferings of Christ "not expiatory," he considered this "the main idea" of the apostle in Rom. 3: 25, 26. He also makes this general remark, "When therefore *the blood of Christ* is spoken of in the New Testament, it means the offering of his life as a sacrifice, or his *death* as an EXPIATION." Mr. B. indeed truly affirms that the apostle desired "*to be just like Christ:* alike in moral character, in suffering, and in destiny:" *i. e.*, I apprehend, holy in character, patient in suffering, and to share in his Master's sufferings, and in the glory which is to follow. Mr. Ham may as well infer that these words of Mr. Barnes exclude the truth, that Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church and King in Zion, because he says the apostle desired to be "*in destiny*" "just like Christ," as to infer that his words exclude *expiation* because he says the apostle desired to be "*in suffering*" "just like Christ."

Our friend remarks, "The Cross of the 'orthodox' churches is the symbol of ideas exclusively identified with Christ as the fulfiller in behalf of the human race, of a mission, which the moral government demanded, and which they could not fulfil themselves. It symbolizes the competency to do and suffer, what divine justice made indispensable to the forgiveness of men's sins and their acceptance with God, but for which mankind are wholly incompetent."

Whether or not the Cross was that "which the moral government demanded," the reader may determine for himself by reference to Rom. 3: 25, 26; Heb. 9: 22, &c. If the gracious fact, that the saved are "reconciled to God by the death of his Son," does not teach that fallen man is "wholly incompetent" to reconcile himself to God, does it not necessarily follow, that his agonizing death, *for this purpose*, was nugatory and superfluous?

It is objected that "according to Christ's teaching—man himself must *have a Cross*—and take up his cross," &c.; but according to the "orthodox" view, "Christ alone can touch the Cross—he alone can 'take up' the cross, because he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions."—What is the argument here? It is this, if the disciple cannot bear a cross *in all respects* as his Master, he cannot bear any cross *at all*. I ask our intelligent friend if this is sound reasoning? I ask him to take a more enlarged view of "Christ's teaching." The dear Savior indeed has taught that every true disciple "takes up" his cross and "bears" it; but when, I ask, for the holy truth's sake, did he ever teach that any disciple must take up *his* cross, or "shed" *his* "blood—FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS," as he taught respecting his own Cross? Certainly, for the honor of the Son of the Blessed, we maintain that, in this sense, "Christ alone can touch the cross—he alone can express its significance and fulfill its conditions." We do say, in reference to this point, to men and angels, to cherubim and seraphim, "stand off," presume not to share an iota of the honor of the Son of God as "the propitiation—for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2: 2. Penitent and believing sinners have indeed a precious and glorious "*inheritance*" in the Cross, but "the christianity of the New Testament," while it recognizes some important similarity between the Cross of the Master and that of his disciple, recognizes also an important distinction. This I have proved by the Savior's own words above quoted, and by numerous other passages. This, I submit, proves the fallacy of our friend's inference from the passages relative to the disciple bearing the cross, that "the idea of *expiation* cannot enter into its doctrinal significance" in respect to the Cross of Christ.

Phil. 3: 10, it is asked, "If Christ's 'sufferings' and 'death' were *expiatory*, how could Paul suppose that his sufferings could be in fellowship with those of Christ, and *his* death be conformable to, or resemble, Christ's death?" I reply that they could not be so *in all respects*, but that they could be so *in various respects*. I respectfully submit to Mr. Ham, whether or not the oversight of this important distinction is not an error interwoven with his eloquent writings. Paul's sufferings were "in fellowship with those of Christ," inasmuch as they were endured in the *same* holy warfare with the powers of darkness, and for the manifestation of the *same* holy truth, In this important sense *his* death was conformable or resembled that of his divine Master. As Mr, H. himself remarks, "The experience of Christ and his disciples is one in principle, when they suffer for righteousness' sake, and one in actual fact, when, like their Master, their uncompromising fidelity costs them their life's blood. Then they drink of the cup that he drank of and are baptized with the baptism wherewith he was baptized." In this respect, they had "*a common experience* with Christ," but this is no proof that Christ had no other experience in which they could not participate.

The General of an army, with his subordinate officers and all his soldiers, have "a common experience;" engaged in the same cause, exposed to similar dangers, toils, and sufferings, they have a a common fellowship. Yet there is an important distinction. The General occupies a "*unique*" position: on him devolves the authority and responsibility of supreme command. In this, not a man in the entire army can participate. Many may fall on the sanguinary field, but the death of the General may be attended with consequences which attach to none other. So the Captain of Salvation and his followers are engaged in the same warfare, and have fellowship in its toils and sufferings, and final glorious victory, the passage to which is through the same gate of death. Yet the death of the former may involve consequences to which the death of the latter may have no claim. As the "one Lord," "Mediator," "Head," and "King," he stands "*unique*" in unrivalled glory.

Our talented friend must yet unite with us "in the new song, saying, Thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and has redeemed us to God BY THY BLOOD out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."

"THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS."—The *concluding* article of Br. HAM on this subject will appear in our next. The amount of original matter on hand seemed to make it necessary to lay it over this time. We trust this question can be as calmly discussed as any other. Till a writer denies Bible *authority*, we do not judge him out of our christian sympathy if his tempers and life are in harmony with Jesus.—[EDITOR.

A TEST APPLIED.

Br. Storrs—The Rev. R. S. Foster, of your city, in his work on Holiness or Christian Purity, as taught by the Methodists, has some excellent remarks in reply to objections made against that doctrine by its opponents. I should like to call attention to those remarks when applied to the doctrine of the non-immortality of man. Under the head of objections considered, chapter 4th, he says:—

"To the doctrine taught in the foregoing chapters, it is admitted there are some seeming objections; and to what truths are there not? Nor would we account them insignificant. They are apparently weighty and serious; and however clear and conclusive we may think the reasonings upon which the doctrine is based, it is by no means complete until these objections are candidly and completely answered. The work is but half done, when what we conceive to be a clear chain of scriptural and argumentative proofs is presented to the reader. Opposite proofs are presented by antagonists equally respectable for numbers, talents, and piety with ourselves, to disprove our views, and no dogmatism, no assurance, no attenuated chain of reasoning, will meet the case, if there are grave objections unanswered. Errorists declaim much about evidence—make great show of proof—adduce long lists of arguments—flourish trumpets of reasoning; but they avoid the rencontre with objections—they find no heart for this.

"The reason is apparent: much that is plausible may be said in favor of any proposition, but a real objection is difficult to answer, and unanswered must create doubt, if it does not prove fatal. One valid objection is fatal to a million proofs. Truth has no real objections, error has many. Nor would we, in meeting objections, present them in a weak and impaired, aspect. Let us contemplate them in all their strength—in their utmost force. This because it is our interest to know the truth and nothing less, nothing else. We have no interest to dissemble in favor of any theory, however cherished. It is truth alone that we are concerned to know. What, then, are the difficulties encompassing the doctrine for which we contend? Why should we give it a questioning reception, and not at once, with warm cordiality, welcome it into the chamber of our confidence? There are a number of seeming reasons: I say seeming reasons because I hope to show, however plausible, they are not real. They are of sufficient importance to cause to closely examine our ground, but not sufficiently invincible, as I hope, to cause us to abandon it or leave our opposers without excuse.

"1st. The first objection offered is this: The doctrine cannot be true because many Christians do not receive it,—the most learned and excellent divines in great numbers do not receive it, it is not now, and it has not been the belief of the majority of the Church. Many, with undoubted ability and sincerity, have studied the Scriptures for a whole life time, have never found this doctrine therein taught; but an opposite and antagonistic doctrine? How is this to be explained? Were these men, the majority, in error? Were they not equal in ability to arrive at the truth with their opposers? Were they not as candid and sincere? Why then must we believe they were in error? This is no trifling objection: He would be rashly indiscreet, foolishly self-assured, who could turn away from it without consideration.

"But what then have we to weigh against this objection to break its force? An array of other great names, an equal amount of learning and respectability, and candor, and application? No. This might balance, but not settle the difficulty. We meet it with the word of the Lord! One '*Thus saith the Lord*' is more powerful than all the opinions of all the men the world ever contained. The objection is apparently strong, but really feeble. Feeble, because it carries the doctrine to an improper tribunal. It brings incompetent evidence. It is not a question dependent on human opinions, however respectable and worthy of credit; it appeals to one, single, and transcendently higher umpire—*the Word of God*. But what then? Who shall judge what the word of God is? Let every man examine for himself, as he must give an account, and so judge. If he finds the doctrine therein let him embrace it; if not, let him reject it! This is all—this is plain."

Now, if all the array of objections enumerated above are "feeble, without force, and falacious,—are incompetent evidence, and not worthy of credit, because it carries the doctrine to an improper tribunal, and the only tribunal or umpire is the Word of God," the subject is brought down to a very narrow compass; as "the Scriptures authorize the doctrine, and this in a great variety of methods, with great clearness and frequency, it is not readily to be credited that the same inspired authority teaches another doctrine contrary to this so explicitly inculcated."

The soundness of the above rule will be admitted by every fair and candid mind, and I should really like to have Br. Foster apply the rule to the "one thus saith the Lord," and the one objection which I have to submit:—

1 Tim. 6: 15, 16, "Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the KING of Kings, and LORD of Lords; who *only hath immortality*, dwelling in the light which no man hath seen nor can see: to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen."

The objection is, the term *immortal* or *immortality*, is not applied to man, in the Old or New Testaments, only as an object to be sought after and to be obtained, as the gift of God, through Jesus Christ alone.

If it were necessary I might multiply texts and objections to the doctrine of inherent immortality, almost without number, but I think the above sufficient. JEFFERSON MAYELL.

Albany, N. Y., April 22, 1854.

IS THIS INFIDELITY?

BY N. DABB.

The advocates of the soul's immortality, the consciousness of the dead, and the eternal torments of the wicked, frequently prefer the charge of infidelity against those who differ from them on these points. Perhaps they find it easier to do this than to answer their arguments. To show the utter groundlessness of this charge, we submit the following for your consideration:—

Is it infidelity to believe that the Scriptures are the *only* and *all-sufficient* standard, both of faith and practice; and that all religious questions should be submitted to its supreme authority *alone*? "To the law and to the testimony," &c.—Isa. 8: 20.

Is it infidelity to believe that "The Lord God formed MAN," not a part of him—not his *body* merely, but MAN, the ENTIRE MAN,—"of the dust of the ground?"—Gen. 2: 7. Observe, he was a *Man* before he lived; then God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *Man* became a living soul,"—not an *ever-living* soul, but a "living soul," or creature, or person, as the Hebrew word *nephesh* signifies. This language evidently means no more than that this "breath of life," simply caused the lifeless *Man* to live—to become conscious. He was made *alive* by being made to breathe.

Is it infidelity to believe, that taking away this breath constitutes the DEATH threatened in Gen. 2: 17? "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die:" Heb., "dying, thou shalt die." We believe this to have been the case; and the true explanation of this text is given by God himself in Gen. 3: 19: "Till thou *return* unto the ground, for *out of it wast* THOU *taken*; for *dust* THOU *art*, and *unto dust shalt* THOU *return*." Observe, God says, "dust *thou*,"—not a part of thee, but "dust *thou* art," &c. We believe that the same breath that caused Adam to *live*, inspired all animals with *life*. Hence "they have ALL one breath."—Ecc. 3: 19. Gen. 7: 22, "All in whose nostrils was the *breath of life*, [Heb., the breath of the spirit of life,] of all that was in the dry land *died*." Also Gen. 6: 17. This "breath of the spirit of life," passing through the lungs, and coming in contact with the blood, vitalizes it, and gives it life; hence how appropriate the language, Lev. 17: 11, "For the *life* of the flesh is in the *blood*." 14 v., "Ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh, for *the life of all flesh is the blood thereof*." Also Gen. 9: 4. These and numerous other passages affirm the blood is the life. Theologians affirm that the life resides in an "immaterial and immortal soul." "Let God be true, but every man a liar;" so said Paul, and so say we. The breath contains the spirit, (or principle of life diffused in the atmosphere.) This principle of life vitalizes the blood, and this, in its turn, gives life to the *flesh*, or entire creature. This spirit is no more a part of the creature, than it was part of Adam before he lived; but it is *essential* to the developement of the functions of life. This breath, or spirit of life, is in God's hands; and is entirely at his disposal. Dan. 6: 23, "The God in whose hand thy *breath* is." Ps. 104: 29, "Thou takest away their *breath*; they die, and return to the dust." Ps. 146: 4, "His *breath* goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, *in that very day his thoughts perish*." Job 34; 14, 15, "If he gather unto himself his spirit, and his breath, (i.e., God's spirit, and God's breath,) *all flesh* shall perish together, and *man* shall turn again to dust." Job 27: 3, "All the while my *breath* is in me, and the *spirit of God* is in my nostrils."

Is it infidelity to believe, that man was created neither mortal nor immortal, but with a capacity for either; his future and final condition being left to be determined by his own obedience or disobedience? Immortality was the great privilege offered to him on the one hand, and death (literal extinction of being,) the penalty on the other.

Is it infidelity to believe, that to this death all the race is doomed through Adam's sin? "By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin, and so death passed upon all men."—Rom. 5: 12.

Is it infidelity to believe God's word, Hosea 13: 14, "I will redeem them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from *death*; O death I will be thy plagues; O grave I will be thy destruction." The redeeming plan was introduced to counteract this curse of death. As man had forfeited his privilege of immortality, and become subject to *death*, Christ came, and suffered death for him; that he might have the opportunity of recovering through Christ, what he had lost in Adam.

Is it infidelity to believe that immortality is ONLY to be obtained through faith in Christ? "He that believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life*, but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see *life*." John 3: 36.

Is it infidelity to believe, that a man cannot be dead and alive at the same time?—that the state of death is a state of unconsciousness? and that "the dead know not anything?" Ecc.: 9: 5.

Is it infidelity to believe that, for a future existence, man is dependent entirely upon a resurrection from the dead? "For if the dead rise not . . . . then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."—1 Cor. 15: 16–18. Our Lord, and his Apostles *invariably* directed their hearers and readers to this, as the great and supreme object of the Christian's hope. "I will raise him up at the last day."—John 6: 54. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection from the dead."—Phil. 3: 11.

Is it infidelity to believe, that men will neither go to reward nor punishment, until they shall have passed the ordeal of the judgment? "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this [not heaven or hell, and *then* the judgment, but] the judgment."—Heb. 9: 27.

Is it infidelity to believe that the second advent of Christ will be pre-millennial, and not post-millennial, as is now generally taught? "For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."—Matt. 24: 38, 39. In the primitive church the second coming of Christ, and its associated

doctrine, the resurrection from the dead, seemed to occupy the very *first* place in their theology. They were always dwelling upon it: it seemed to be ever present to their minds. This must be evident to all who carefully read Paul's sermons and epistles. But in modern theology, these doctrines occupy a very subordinate position, and are regarded as things of *comparatively* small importance. How is this? Does it not arise from teaching the unscriptural doctrine, that men go to heaven or hell immediately at death? for, in that case, what importance can men attach to the advent of Christ and a resurrection? But if men can have no future existence without a resurrection, and without Christ's coming to raise them, then we see at once why the early christians attached so much importance to them.

Is it infidelity to believe this glorious event is now near, "even at the doors?"—Matt. 24: 33.

Is it infidelity to believe, that this earth renovated, and purified from sin, will be the eternal dwelling place of the saints? and that Christ will here sit upon the throne of his father David, and reign for ever and ever? Dan. 7: 27, "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under* the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Ps. 37: 9: Matt. 5: 5. Luke 1: 32, 33, "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kindom there shall be no end." Dan. 7: 14.

Is it infidelity to believe, that God meant what he said, Ezek. 18: 20, "The soul that sinneth IT shall die," in a literal, and not in a figurative sense? Through the whole bible, LIFE and DEATH run together like parallel lines; and what right have men to alter the plain meaning of God's words? "I set before you *life* and *death*."—Deut. 30: 19. "If ye live after the flesh ye shall *die*, but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."—Rom. 8: 13. There is not a word in the scriptures about eternal *misery* for the sinner. *Men* use the words very freely, but the bible never. Nor is there one passage, which, if fairly interpreted, gives countenance to the idea. The wicked are threatened with *death, destruction*, and words of like import, but never *once* with eternal, conscious suffering. O that men would be content to take the words of God, as they find them, and not subvert and destroy their meaning, for no other purpose than to support their man-made theories.

Is it infidelity to believe, that when both sin and the sinner shall have been destroyed, the universe shall become "one solid temple of pure good?" Rev. 5, 13, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. Amen."

If believing these things constitutes infidelity, then, be it known unto you, men and brethren,—I AM AN INFIDEL.

☞ The foregoing will be issued in a *Tract* in a few days. Price 60 cts. per 100; $5 per 1000.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JUNE 1, 1854.

PROPITIATORY DEATH OF CHRIST.

EDWARD WHITE—author of that excellent work "*Life in Christ*,"—has favored us with a communication on the topic at the head of these remarks. We have long desired that Br. White, Br. Dobney, and others on the other side of the Atlantic, who are with us on the great fact of LIFE ETERNAL *only* through Jesus Christ, might feel themselves at full liberty to express themselves in the BIBLE EXAMINER on other topics connected with this theme, though they might take a different view from us on some points. We are gratified, therefore, that Br. White has given us something from his pen. We shall be pleased to "give" him "the opportunity" he speaks of, in the conclusion of his letter. Anything that exalts our Redeemer, and the love of his Father, in giving us such a Deliverer from *sin and death*, is in harmony with the feelings of our heart—especially if scripturally sustained. On this great subject we have only one desire—one wish: and that is, *to be in exact harmony with the mind of God*. Any doctrine that shall in the least degree lessen in the mind the value or importance of Christ's great work, as God's appointed Deliverer, can have no place in our mind, if we see its tendency is in that direction. The extremes on this—and all other topics—we hope, through the mercy of God, to avoid. Without the *death* of Christ we see no way for man's redemption. If he would lift us up from death he must go where we are to be found.—Death had passed upon all our race, in the sentence, and in its process of execution. Jesus "both died and rose, and revived, that he might be *Lord both of the dead* and living." By his death he has obtained the right to deliver the dead from death: and in his resurrection he brought up the "*keys of death and hades*." But for his death a deliverer never would have entered *hades* or invaded successfully the dominions of death. Christ went down under death that he might *abolish* its power; for it was "*impossible*" for death to hold one who had not sinned, and upon whom therefore it had no claim; and especially had it no claim upon, nor could it hold one who had manifested a perfect harmony with the will of God. Such was the fact in Jesus' case. His death became necessary by the entrance of sin into the world, and man's subjection to the power of death in consequence of sin. God subjected the race of Adam to death *in hope*. What is that hope? It is the hope of the resur-

rection to life eternal. Hence "the Lord Jesus Christ" is "*our hope.*" He is "the Resurrection and the Life." His death—the shedding of his blood—was the price he paid for the right to redeem, or deliver, us from sin and *death.* Not in the sense of dying "*in our room and stead,*" or in the sense of "*paying our debts,*" but that by descending to the lowest condition to which we were subjected, he might lift us up by his life-reviving power: he *touched* our dead condition, and became united to his dead members—all true believers who fall asleep in him—and by virtue of that union God will, by Christ, "at the last day," as certainly raise up to life eternal all such, as that he raised up Christ himself from the dead. In this *special* work of redemption Christ has no partners, nor helpers. He, *alone,* of all that ever dwelt in flesh, died for us—for our redemption—as none other ever did or ever can. To him, and to him *alone,* be all the glory of human redemption; but to God his Father, and our Father, be all the glory of a full and *free* pardon of sins, of his own unbought and boundless mercy, but under the administration of His Son, whom He has given power over all flesh that he might give Eternal Life to as many as God the Father has given him. But we must not detain our readers longer from Br. White's communication.

—

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner:—

My Dear Sir.—On the doctrine of the propitiatory death of Christ, the case, I believe, may be fairly stated thus: Mr. Ham supposes that because the crucifixion of Christ is denounced in the scriptures as an act of wickedness on the part of the perpetrators, it cannot have been in accordance with the will of God, with a view to the expiation of the sin of the word: and, chiefly, if not altogether, on this foundation, he proceeds to explode the doctrine that the death of Christ "answered a great judicial purpose in the moral government of God."

If there be any difficulty in reconciling the wickedness of the crucifiers with the purpose of God in this event, I submit that Mr. Ham must bear the burden of it along with those whom he calls "the priests of a popular prejudice." He maintains that "the obedience unto death of Christ is set forth for our imitation." Obedience implies an authority to whom it is rendered. What was the authority to which Christ rendered obedience unto death?" Clearly it was the authority of God. Christ came into the world to do the will of God. It was then the will of God that Christ should be "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." God willed that Christ should die. How will Mr. Ham reconcile this with the position that the crucifixion was a "wicked act," an "act uncalled for," an "act most displeasing and offensive to God." It seems, however, that Mr. Ham knows how to regard the crucifixion of Christ in one point or view as a sinful act on the part of men, yet as designed by God to subserve a moral purpose in the administration of the divine government. That purpose he believes to be to afford a pattern for our imitation. He distinctly says that God was not surprised by the crucifixion; that he had foreseen it, and that God "sent Christ into the world" to "set us a perfect example of holy obedience," that being an obedience unto death. Very well. Then, if the crucifixion of Christ, however wicked an act on the part of the Jews, "subserved" one "moral purpose" under the divine government, it may, for anything that appears by this argument, have subserved another. If it were intended by God as an example for our imitation, it may have been intended as an expiatory sacrifice "for the sin of the world." If the wickedness of the act on the side of man forbids us to think that God could have been consenting to the death of Christ in the character of an expiatory sacrifice, that same wickedness must forbid us to think that God could have been consenting to his death in the character of an example of holy obedience. But Mr. Ham maintains that it *was* according to his will that Christ should be obedient unto death as a pattern; and therefore he is prevented, in my judgment, from using the consideration of the wickedness of the crucifiers as an argument to prove that the crucifixion cannot have been "designed to subserve any great judicial purpose in the administration of God." "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and with wicked hands have crucified and slain." "It pleased the Lord to bruise him; He hath put him to grief." "God commendeth his his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us."

I venture humbly to think that, with all respect for Mr. Ham's superior learning, piety and sagacity, a few considerations on the method of God's dealings with evil will set in a clearer light the fact that there is no inconsistency in the two propositions, that the act of the crucifiers was an enormous crime on their part, while yet the death of Christ was designed by the Almighty Controller of the Universe as a sacrifice for the sin of the world.

It is in the dark sphere of evil that it has pleased the Deity especially to unfold the attributes of

His own perfect and eternal nature; and all the forces and issues of evil have been comprehended within the vast circle of His designs. Sin, being in every case a transgression of law, must be considered as rebellion against the will of God, in one sense of that phrase: but since God has chosen to permit the existence of rebellion, there is another sense in which it is also true that God has willed the existence of that which is contrary to his will. This verbal paradox will not trouble the understandings of any who remember, that in the one case the term *Will* stands for the moral law which God has commanded the creation to obey; in the other it stands for the determination of the Almighty with respect to the results of the free-agency of those who were commanded to obey him.

All evil or sin is the work of sinners, the action of disobediant wills following the promptings of inflamed passion, in opposition to the suggestions of the spirit of God. God has nothing to do with the production of sin. "All that is in the world, the lusts of the flesh, of the eye, and the pride of life, are not of the Father, but of the world." "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man." But God foresees all sin, the evil acts of evil agents, in the same manner as Christ foresaw Peter's three-fold denial on the night of the crucifixion. How God foresees in all cases, without predestinating the sin, we do not understand. It is one of the mysteries of the Infinite Mind. But even we can see that a person habitually accustomed to any course of thought and feeling will certainly act in a particular manner under pressing circumstances of temptation. And since a fallen nature unrenewed by divine grace, is certain to act according to the inward law of sin and death, a law nearly as regular in its operations as any law of holiness and life in heaven, it is not difficult to conceive that the Omniscient God can trace an indefinite series of motives and passions to their practical results, and foretell with infallible precision the deeds which "wicked hands" will be ready to do.

Further, it is demonstrable from the history of divine revelation, that God, by His omnipotence, limits and restrains the manifestations of wickedness. This He does sometimes for the honor of His own character as Governor of the world, sometimes for the welfare of his obedient servants who might otherwise be overwhelmed by the violence of evil, and sometimes out of compassion to the evil agents themselves. God from his inaccessible throne of glory thus exercises a supreme dominion not only over all the righteous powers of heaven and earth, but also over all the permitted forces of evil present and foreseen: and weaving the whole sum of events into the web of universal providence, He employs all agencies, evil and good, working out the counsel of His own will;—the highest will which includes for wise, but to us unaccountable, purposes, the temporary permission of evil itself: so that the blind victims of rebellion are yoked along with saints and cherubim, and obliged to draw along the chariot of the many-handed Omnipotence.

The application of these statements to the crucifixion of Christ is, I think, at once easy and just. Into the fabric of the world's evil history the God of love has, from the beginning, woven the shining pattern of the system of redemption. Be has woven, I say, the beautiful threads of his mercy to sinners into the substance of the woof and the weft of the cross purposes of good and sinful agents here below. The foreknowledge of God casting a steady illumination over the boundless future, His foreknowledge of all wicked men, with their tendencies and temptations, was accompanied by a parallel running line of "determinate counsel," as to the manner in which he would cause them to execute his designs. The developement, therefore, of the natural characters of the actors in the condemnation of Jesus, and they included specimens of every variety of wickedness, was made to fit into a different but correspondent series of events and developements in the life and the teaching of Jesus our Lord; as that the "wicked hands" embrued in that "precious blood," without ceasing to be at all the less wicked (since it is the motive that constitutes the sin), actually accomplished the death of Christ, which, viewed on the divine side of the event, was God's method for the redemption of the world. Since "it behoved the Christ to suffer," that event might have been brought about by a direct infliction from the hand of Heaven; but for wise reasons God appointed that sinful men should be the sacrificers of that sacred Lamb, who thus "gave his life for the life of the world," and as "a ransom for many." The Lord sitteth above the water floods! Above the flaming surges of that fiery sea of human and diabolic passion, the Lord sitteth King for ever! He taketh the wise in their own craftiness. The deceived and the deceiver are his. "The things which had before been written, God did so fulfill," and evil, raging in a storm against the monarchy of God, was permitted to strike the blow which has riven the edifice of Satan's dominion down to its foundations. "Through death Christ has destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the Devil, and

delivered them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage."

I do think that these considerations are sufficient to prove that the evil character of the crucifiers is no bar in the way of believing that a judicial moral design was contemplated by God in the death of Christ. That such a judicial moral design *was* contemplated in it, is to be proved by other evidence—the evidence of scripture; and I have no hesitation in saying, that if you will give me the opportunity, I will make it appear that it is impossible to do greater violence to the scriptures than to attempt to expel from them the doctrine of the propitiatory death of our Redeemer, as understood by the Baptist and Congregational churches of our country. I remain, my dear sir, yours sincerely and respectfully. EDWARD WHITE.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor—I am seeking no advantage over you in the statement of a question. All I ask is, that we may get at the true issue and discuss it. I affirm that we are compound beings, consisting of a material *body*, and an immaterial *spirit*—that the spirit of man *leaves the body at death*, and has a *separate* and *conscious* existence between death and the resurrection. All this you deny. I offer to discuss it, and submit a question fairly involving, as I think, all these points; you decline, but submit in its stead a question which, if rigidly adhered to, might confine us to the composition of Adam alone, and exclude not only all others of our race, but also your own most cherished doctrine of the death of the soul. Besides, I cannot "affirm" that the body of Adam, which returned to dust again ages since, now *has* a soul in connection with it, in the grave. This may be your doctrine, but it is not mine. But that "the creature man—formed of dust *had* a distinct entity called the soul,"—once "superadded," but now separate from it,—I am ready to affirm. And this is precisely what you deny, and what I suppose you wish to deny by taking the negative of the question.

If this is what you mean I am ready to proceed; but I shall not affirm that the body of Adam "has" *now* a soul in the grave, "superadded" to that body.

If, therefore, you wish to confine yourself and me to the composition of Adam, as he *was*, as he walked in Eden before he died; you had better substitute the past tense *had* for the present "has" of your proposition. This done, we shall understand each other, and I shall not be called upon to affirm what I do not believe.

With this slight, amendment, then, which I think will commend itself to your approval, I shall proceed to show that the creature man, which God formed of dust, had, subsequently, a superadded entity called the soul.

But to go to the "root" of the subject, (for which I am no less anxious than yourself,) it will be necessary to show first that there is such a thing as *spirit* in the universe—an essence entirely distinct from matter—and that there are beings or entities composed wholly of spirit. If I can establish this point it will then be in time to show that Adam consisted in part of such an "entity" "superadded" to his body.

My first argument, then, in proof of the existence of spirits, is the existence of a God, who is a spirit. "GOD IS A SPIRIT"—John 4: 24. That God is a pure spirit, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible; and unconnected with bodily form or organs I shall not attempt further to prove, unless you deny it. He is "A SPIRIT;" and Christ says expressly, Luke 24: 39, "a spirit *hath not flesh and bones* as ye see me have." Upon the authority of Christ, then, as above cited, I affirm that in God himself we have a glorious specimen of spiritual immaterial existence—a being, thinking, creating, upholding, governing, &c., without a body or material organs. Though he has at times manifested himself to the bodily senses of men, as a flame, a dove, a human form or voice, yet is he the invisible God, whom no man hath seen or can see.—Col. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 17; Heb. 11: 27. Now as the spiritual nature of God is a fundamental point, at the very "root" of the subject, I place it here in the foreground, clearly and distinctly, that you may as distinctly admit, or deny and controvert it. And I will here advertise you that the fact that God is a spirit is a point upon which I shall depend not a little in proving the spirituality and two-fold nature of man. If, therefore, you design to controvert it at all, now is the time to do it. And as you have intimated that our space must be limited in the present number, I pause for you to define your position in regard to this my first argument, and to bring forth your strong reasons. H. MATTISON.

Response by the Editor.

We regret that the question for discussion, as stated by us, should have led Prof. MATTISON to

think there was danger of "confining us to the composition of Adam alone and exclude all others of our race." We really do not suppose there is any material difference between the "composition of Adam" and his posterity; hence we conclude if his composition or constituent parts can be accurately defined, we shall be informed equally as to "all others of our race;" especially, as Paul saith, 1 Cor. 15: "The *first man* Adam was made a living soul; . . . the first man *is of the earth*, earthy; . . . as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." We certainly did not expect our friend Mattison to "affirm that the body of Adam . . . *now* has a soul in connection with it, in the grave." Really we did not once suspect our proposition embraced any such idea. Our word "*has*," on which our friend stumbled, was of course designed to embrace the *living race*, or posterity of Adam, who all have their "foundation in the dust" as well as Adam. We have no occasion, therefore to "substitute the past tense, *had*, for the present, 'has.'" We think our readers will understand the matter. By "the creature man, formed of the dust of the ground," we mean any man—every man of the race of Adam.

The Professor's first point is to show, "that there is such a thing as *spirit*—an essence entirely distinct from matter—and that there are beings, or entities, composed wholly of spirit." "Composed," we suppose, here means "*formed*." It can, therefore, have a relation only to *created* beings. An "argument," then, drawn from the nature of the *uncreated* God, we submit, is irrelevant to the question at issue. That "God is a spirit" we do not deny; but because a spirit hath not "flesh and bones" that is no evidence it is "unconnected with" matter in some form. Air has not "flesh and bones," but is matter nevertheless. The same may be said of electricity, and a thousand other things. Jesus did not say that a spirit was destitute of materiality, but only that it possessed not that specific form of it possessed by man, *viz.*: "flesh and bones." Infinite forms of vitalized, or living matter may be in existence, for all we know, without possessing flesh and bones. But whatever is true, or not true, in this direction, the argument drawn from the *uncreated* cannot bear on a *created* being. Whether God is "immaterial" or not we shall not stop to dispute; we have only to say, *It is a pure assumption*, without a particle of scripture authority. "The spiritual nature of God" is not questioned by us, and therefore Bro. M. need not to waste time nor fill space to prove that point. Whether the Prof.'s *notion* of a spiritual nature is true or not, is another point entirely. That he needs to start at such an infinite distance from man is ominous that he is aware there is no *direct* testimony in the Bible in support of the theological notion of a distinct entity superadded to the man of dust, called the soul. How did the Lord God form *man?* He "*formed man of the dust of the ground.*"—Bible. Did the Lord God form a distinct entity, called *the soul*, and place it in this man, or any other man? "*Yes*," saith my friend. Well—where is the *testimony* to the fact, if it be a fact? Is there a plain "Thus saith the Lord" for it? We answer, *No.* If there was, our friend would not need to travel up to the *infinite* to get a starting point. But we shall see, as he proceeds, whether he can *descend* from the lofty *ascent* without affirming, "Ye shall be as gods."

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Dear Br. Storrs:—In your remarks in the EXAMINER of April 15th, upon my letter, you state very fairly the previous question which must be settled before our view respecting the nature of the soul, and the intermediate state, can be harmonized, viz.: "Has the creature man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, a distinct entity, above and besides, called the soul?" What is meant by the phrase "above and besides," I do not quite understand, since no one can suppose that the *mere* body constitutes the man. And if it is urged that the *living or vivified* body makes the man, that simply puts the question in a new form, viz.—Is the *life*, or the *vital power*, a distinct entity? And again, are the *life* and the *soul* the same, or are they different things? These are very important in some respects, and in other respects very unimportant.

Unimportant, because they are questions of philosophy about which we may hold the most varying opinions without harm to our christian faith, and without losing faith in the power of God. And yet important, because they may be connected with our system of faith, to prevent our christian harmony, or to present occasion of scepticism to those who are not christians.

And because they are *prima facie* unimportant, I wish it understood that I do not present my views upon them for the purpose of insisting upon them, though I deem them most scriptural and reasonable. Rather, I deprecate the extended discussion of this subject in a religious journal, for I have seen, and the history of the church is full of, the ill effects of nice questions about our relations to matter, and to the various *forms* and *methods*

of existence. These questions may be very fair and proper in themselves; but an undue love of them begets a habit of mind that is un-moral, and our philosophy (we must have philosophy) comes to be an anatomy of virtue, rather than a love and practice of it. "There is but one way," says Dr. Arnold, "that men of speculative minds can be safe from scepticism: they must pray, and visit the poor." Matter is not inherently evil, as the Manichæans supposed; but both matter and spirit become evil to us, when we discuss the mere nature of either, and our relation to God is forgotten.

But these questions do become important when a doctrine of our relation to matter is proposed with a "Thus saith the Lord" for its voucher. Then, if not before, we must resort to the law and the testimony. The Bible, then, must decide whether the proposed view shall be an article of our christian faith, or a useful or indispensable weapon of our christian warfare. And so, without further prelude, let us come to this question of the distinct and un-material nature of the soul.

One word of definition. By *matter* I mean that kind of substance which is subject to physical laws. By *spirit* I mean that kind of substance which is not subject to physical laws. If any one objects that all substance is of course material, that is saying that my distinction is an idle one, and it implies also that God is material; for the Divine Being is certainly substance, and not mere quality or attribute. If my friend chooses to say, nevertheless, that substance is matter, he is welcome to his definition; only let us understand each other, so we may not talk at cross-purposes. I prefer my definition, which is certainly harmless, as it proves nothing, though it will be convenient if there should appear to be a difference corresponding to my distinction.

And now to the testimony. Does the Bible nowhere state, or intimate, a distinction between the soul and the body? Are they inseparable? If inseparable, are they *mutually* dependent, so that *neither* can subsist without the other? Or, is *one* dependent, and the other capable, under God, of a separate existence? And if one can survive the other, is that survivance, either by the Bible, or by reason, any proof of its immortality? These are fair questions upon which the Bible may throw some light. Or if the Bible, as a revelation of moral duty and of final destiny, gives no *accurate* reply to these questions, then we may form our opinions upon the rational and the possible, and if we avoid dogmatism, no one shall charge us with impiety, or with unbelief.

"Man became a living soul." And because the same man was "formed of the dust of the ground," it is inferred that the body and the soul are, somehow, the same thing, or they are at least uni-fied in the one being, the MAN. And if I say anything about the "breath of life," which was infused into the shapen clay, it is replied that we are not told of this breath becoming the living soul,—but it was the MAN that became a living soul. And it is urged that God "formed man of *matter*—made him a *material* being; and the apostle declares, 'The first man is of *the earth*, earthy.' And Jesus our Lord declares, in the most solemn manner, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh;' hence . . . till we are *begotten* again by the Spirit of God, men, any man, all men, are animal, material and only such."

Such is the argument. It was *matter* that became a living soul, and therefore man is only material. Let us try the argument and see what it will prove. "THE WORD BECAME FLESH." Now the clothing of the Word with flesh could no more change its nature than the inspiring of the clay with vital breath could change its nature. And certainly the essential Word was not *transmuted* into material and created flesh. What then? Why, by the same method of reasoning as above, our Lord and Savior, in his incarnation, was Logos, Word, "*and only such.*" His body was either no part of his being, or it was so absorbed in his being as to be no longer distinct and material; and we are driven, in spite of ourselves, to the doctrine of the Docetæ, who began in the very age of the apostles to deny our Lord's humanity, and to whom allusion is made in 1 John 4: 1–3.

I will only add, that word "became" is full of meaning, and hard to understand, in all human languages. To me the second chapter of Genesis appears to prove, not that man is simply material, but the very opposite. This inference will bring upon me a clamor of questions from various quarters, respecting man as compared with the brute, the argument for his immortality, &c., which, with Bible help, I will try to answer soon.

Yours, truly, C. F. HUDSON.

RESPONSE TO BR. HUDSON, BY BR. GREW.

Dear Br. Storrs:—I cheerfully comply with your request to make a few remarks on Br. Hudson's letter.

Our design, I apprehend, is not to enter upon the "questions of philosophy," important or "unimportant," which have no bearing on our Father's revealed truth in the New Testament of his love in Jesus Christ. We would prefer to comply with

"Dr. Arnold's" suggestion, to "pray and visit the poor." These important duties, however, we suppose to be properly consistent with the free discussion of any philosophy which presumes to nullify any part of "The doctrine of the Lord," which abideth forever. Such philosophy the inspired apostle has well denominated "oppositions of science falsely so called."—1 Tim. 6 : 20. Br. Hudson accords with us, in the solemn obligations to obey the divine injunction, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men—and not after Christ."—Col. 2 : 8. Any and every philosophical dogma which denies the divine testimony, that fallen man is "MORTAL,"—Job 4 : 17; that "the wages of sin is DEATH,"—Rom. 6 : 23; that in the very day of death man's "*thoughts* perish," also his *love*, *knowledge*, with all mental powers; Ps. 146 : 4; Eccles. 9 : 5, 6, 10;—any and every philosophical dogma which predicates human immortality, or eternal life, on man's inherent nature, and not on the gratuitous "gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord,"—Rom. 6 : 23; we assign to the category of the wisdom which "is foolishness with God."

Nor is this all our objection to the popular theory of the nature of MAN. This theory, while it annuls the decree that he, the guilty *man*, shall return to dust, and invests him with an indestructible element which bids defiance to the power of death; divests and robs the doctrine of the Resurrection of MAN of all its truth and glory. What does that theory assign to be resurrected? The MAN, whom the voice of inspiration has declared has PERISHED, if there be no resurrection?—1 Cor. 15 : 18. Nay, verily; but a mere appendage, unessential to his vitality and glory. The theory, so far from admitting the scriptural testimony, that death introduced *man* into a state where "there is neither knowledge or device," assures us, that it is the very hour in which he is "made perfect in holiness," and in which he shall "immediately enter into glory."

We ask Br. Hudson if these divine testimonies do not necessarily involve a negative answer to the question "Is the soul a distinct entity" from the material organism? The question is not, whether or not there is *any distinction* between body, soul and spirit. The question is, whether or not, after the Creater had "formed MAN of the dust of the ground," he created and imparted to the *man* thus formed, any spirit, or substance, any thing whatever, capable of vital conscious existence independent of the man formed of the dust of the ground? What is the addition, in the divine testimony, to the declaration that God formed MAN of the dust of the ground? Simply, that he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Is it possible that our intelligent brother can suppose that such a declaration is an adequate basis for the popular theory of a "distinct" independent, indestructible "entity?" Must he not perceive that the foundation of his superstructure "is in the dust?" We ask him to put this declaration, together with the injunction, "Cease from man *whose breath is in his nostrils*," into his metaphysical crucible, and see if it is possible to transmute them, so as to sustain the affirmative of the question at issue. Is not the latter passage of eternal truth a complete refutation of the popular exposition of the former?

It pertains to our respected brother, who at present, we understand, adopts the affirmative of the question at issue, to sustain it by scriptural proof. Hoping that, by the grace of God, truth is our object, we ask him to do so. We thank him for his proposal to "try" to do it. In the letter before us, we find but little argument directly bearing on the question. It is not necessary to the determination of the question of "a distinct entity," to ascertain accurately the properties either of matter or spirit. These indeed transcend, in some respects, the powers of the most acute philosopher. The question is to be determined by the word of the Lord, in which not a single declaration is found that man, *in the general*, or that ever a single man, *by nature*, is immortal.

We ask our brother to favor us with answers, from the Sacred Scriptures, to the "fair questions," proposed in his letter. He refers to the arguments of opponents, but does not, in his first communication, attempt to show their fallacy, with the exception of one or two. In reference to the proposition that "it was matter that became a living soul, and therefore man is only material," Bro. H. remarks, "Let us take the argument and see what it will prove. 'The Word became flesh.' Now the clothing of the Word with flesh could no more change its nature than the inspiring of the clay with vital breath could change its nature."

I understand that the incarnation of the Son of God *did* constitute some change in the nature of his entire person, which then additionally consisted of the "body prepared," *not before assumed*. So also the vital breath changed the nature of the *inanimate* man; by this he 'became a living soul,' or person, which previously he was not. The vital breath did not change the *materiality* of the organic man, neither did the incarnation change the *spirituality* of the Son of God, but in both cases

there was a change in the persons. Adam became a *living* man, and our blessed Lord became the Logos, or Word '*made flesh.*'

But Br. Hudson's question is not, Is man *only* material? It is, "Is the soul a *distinct entity?*" Man may be, and is, a compound being, although his component parts are incapable of distinct and independent vital entity, We do not affirm, *unqualifiedly*, that man is *only* material. The Creator has endowed the material organism with understanding, will, and affection. The question is, do these powers pertain inseparably to the material organism, or to a distinct independent entity? We can find no authority, in either reason or scripture, to deny the former. Our reason requires no denial of the power of God to endow matter with thought. It involves no contradiction. Scripture affirms the cessation of thought with the cessation of animal life.—Ps. 146 : 4. If thought, memory, and affection, prove a "distinct entity in *man*," they prove the same in brutes. If this *is* proved, it constitutes no proof of *immortality*, either for soul or body. This depends on the will of the Creator. On Him every thing is dependent. "He can create and he can destroy." We will wait for our brother's proofs.

HENRY GREW.

To Prof. H. Mattison.

Dear Sir—You are reported in the BIBLE EXAMINER to have said that "the immortality of the soul had not been called in question since the days of our Savior till within the last ten years."

I was amazed at this statement. The following facts are an indication that "Professors," even, *can* be mistaken; and further that it is dangerous to profess acquaintance with that of which we are ignorant.

In the time of Origen, about two hundred years after Christ, a body of men in Arabia asserted that "the human soul, as long as the present state of the world existed, perished at death and died with the body, but that it would be raised again with the body at the time of the resurrection."—Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., Book VI.. Chap. 37.

Read it for yourself—a Professor should read Eusebius and *remember* it too.

About 170 years after Christ, lived a man named Tatian: you may have heard of him. Will you tell me what these words, found in his Oration against the Greeks (c. 13), signify? "*Ouk estin athanatos e psuke kath eauten.*" As you are a *Professor* you do not need to have this translated, and as in your judgment there is not *one* among the believers of this doctrine capable of translating it, I leave it to you, with the bare hint that a *Professor* might be expected to find in it a very distinct intimation shat the soul was *not immortal of itself*.

For your further information, I will give you the words of Dr. A. Clarke, who was as well acquainted with such matters as most Professors, and as this is in plain English it does, not need a translation. Giving Tatian's opinion, he says that the "*Soul cannot be immortal* without union with the Holy Spirit; but partaking of the nature of the flesh *while living without God, dies with the body!*"—Clarke's Succession of Sacred Literature, page 98.

Other "fathers" held an opinion somewhat similar. Justin Martyr and Theophilous, as well as Tatian, "from various reasons, supposed the existence of a soul, which, though *mortal in itself*, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality and immortality, either acquired immortality as a *promised reward*, by its union with the spirit and the right use of liberty; or, in the opposite case, *perishes with the body.*"—Hagenbach Hist. of Doctrines, vol. 1, p. 162.

Irænius Adv. Hæer. ii., 64, speaks of an immortality which is given to man, which is "*Non enim ex nobis, neque, ex nostra natura vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur.*"

Arnobius, who lived about A. D. 306, propounded the idea of the "total annihilation" of the wicked.—Hagenbach, vol. 1, p. 241.

Lactantius, about the same time, when the immortality of the soul was generally believed, "did not regard it as the natural property of the soul, but as the reward of virtue."

I cannot linger longer here. Platonism, heathenism, and other similar systems, made fearful havoc with the truth. Origen—the great defender of the doctrine of natural immortality linked with it the preexistence of the soul, and taught that we might believe in Christ without believing the resurrection, provided we believed firmly the natural immortality of the soul. The Gnostics denied a future resurrection, and taught that the souls of the just ascended immediately to heaven; which doctrine, after being termed *heresy* for near one thousand years, was decreed to be *truth* by the *Roman Church* (at the Council of Florence, I think), and has since been "orthodox" enough—for the majority of those who claim to be the orthodox party—only when hard pressed by our arguments. Then they find it very convenient to take another position.

In 1170, we find among the Jews, Maimonides, called by Dr. Clarke "the most philosophic and intelligent of all the later Jews," declaring the punishment of "excision," or cuttiug off, mentioned in the Law of Moses, "to be restricted to the future life only, and to consist in the total annihilation of the intellectual soul."—See his Com. on the *Mischna*, tr. Sanhedrim, chap. ix. and xi., and *Yad Hachazaka*, vol. 1. *Hilcoth Teshubah*, chap. viii., sec. 1, 5.

Averhoes, an Arabian philosopher who died (according to Leo. Africanus, c. 20), A. D. 1206, denied the distinct existence and immortality of the human soul. He was the most celebrated of all the Arabian philosophers and physicians.

In later times, Luther wrote (Jan. 13, 1522), "It is probable, in my opinion, that with very few exceptions, indeed, THE DEAD SLEEP IN UTTER INSENSIBILITY TILL THE DAY OF JUDGMENT." And you must know that in the twenty-seventh proposition of his defence he reckons the immortality of

the soul with other monstrous opinions found in the Roman dung-hill of decretals.

Cardinal du Perron charges Luther with believing and teaching the mortality of the soul, thereby opposing purgatory. No one has ever been able to contradict successfully that charge, from the fact that we have the statement in Luther's own words. See his letter to Amsdorf.

Sir Thomas More, in his attack on Luther, charges him with teaching that man should, "after this life, feel neither good nor evil in body or soul, till the day of doom:" and Tyndale, the first translator of the Bible into English, so far from denying it to be the teaching of Luther, affirms it to be the very doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. —See Tyndale's answer, Book 4, chap. 9.

In 1530, Wm. Tracy, in his will, committed himself to God, "trusting without any doubt or mistrust, that by his grace and the merits of Jesus Christ, and by virtue of his passion, and of his resurrection, I have and shall have remission of my sins, and RESURRECTION OF BODY AND SOUL, according as it is written (Job 19), I believe that my Redeemer liveth, and that in the last day I shall rise out of the earth, and in my flesh shall see my Savior."

I might add a large number of names to the list I have produced, but I leave these *facts* to combat your *assertion* that the immortality of the soul has not been denied since the time of Christ. Such is not the fact, and if you care as much for truth, as an honest man ought, you will be willing to confess your mistake.

Will you allow your hearers to believe and report that no one since the days of Christ, but a few men within the last ten years, have denied the immortality of the soul?

This is not a matter of argument but of *fact*. Are you willing that men should know *the truth*, or are you determined to imitate the policy of Rome, whose infallible *decrees* have done more to sustain the doctrine of natural immortality than all the writings of holy men of old?

I trust you are an honest man; I do not suspect that you would misrepresent—I regard your statement only as an evidence of lack of knowledge and too great confidence in your position.

I have a dilemma here: I must believe that you did not understand the subject you were talking about, and hence you stated things for truth, of which you had *no evidence*, or else I must assume that you knew the facts, but contradicted them by your statements. As lack of information is more pardonable than falsify, I accept the former alternative, remembering, too, that you will, in your own estimation at least, be equal to those men who "*know nothing of Hebrew or Greek*," and who, consequently, are not to be trusted in their expositions of scripture.

I might cite other authors that have written on this subject, but perhaps these few hints will lead you to look for yourself. I trust the result may be for the glory of our common Lord.

I close with disclaiming any feeling of unkindness or animosity toward you,—wishing you success in the investigation of truth, I remain,

Very truly yours, H. L. HASTINGS.

THE DISCUSSION,—The Question—"*Does the Bible teach that the creature man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a superadded entity called the soul?*" has now two able advocates of the *affirmative* side, who have taken up the question so near at the same time, that we have judged best to let BR. HENRY GREW follow BR. HUDSON in the argument, while we give our attention to PROFESSOR MATTISON. With these two able champions on the affirmative we doubt not the best that can be said will be forthcoming. Others on the *negative* of the question might possibly do better than Br. Grew or ourself, but we shall neither of us admit that others can excel us in desires to know exactly what the Lord saith on this question; nor in a readiness to confess, if we find ourselves in error. The EDITOR of the EXAMINER takes no responsibility for Br. Grew's sentiments in responding to Br. Hudson, nor does he expect Br. G. to be at all responsible for any sentiments the Editor may advance: the discussion will be conducted in the language which each writer, as an independent man, shall think right to employ. Our prayer is, that God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, may shine into all our hearts, that truth may be elicited; and that all of us, engaged in this discussion, may sit at Jesus' feet, and solemnly listen to, and learn the truth at the mouth of God; and may the readers be profited both by the matter and spirit of this discussion. The commencement of the Argument will be found following Br. White's communication.

LETTERS.—We have been obliged to withhold several letters intended for this number. Our friends have continued to express their sympathy for us, and their kind words deeply draw upon our affection for them. We learn that numbers of those who have aided us have themselves sustained severe losses within a short time past. The time will soon come, beloved, when all our losses and trials will cease in the kingdom of God, if we endure patiently unto the end, We, doubtless, shall find there has been a "*need be*" for every trial and loss that has attended our pilgrimage here.

☞ BR. WALTER PRATT'S Post Office address is Windsor, Conn.

DONATIONS since May 15th: Geo. Pease, $1; Peterson & Lenfest, $1; Isaac Dimmick, $2,55; additional from friends in Philadelphia, $20; Catharine Colver, $1; Roswell Hart, $3; Sarah Porter, $1; Joseph J. Ely, $1; F. A. Bronson, $5.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1854. NO. 12.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CROSS.

THE CROSS—THE ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

BY J. PANTON HAM.

[Concluded from page 150.]

In view of the remarks made under the preceding section, the reader will experience no difficulty, but, on the contrary, will perceive a peculiar propriety and force in those Scripture expressions which attribute to the blood of Christ a morally cleansing virtue. Thus, "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin;" "How much more the blood of Christ , . . purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God;" "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," &c. Under the Levitical dispensation, blood as well as water was a symbolical instrument of purification, —when sprinkled, whether on persons or the sacred utensils of the sanctuary, it denoted sanctification, or purification: and this analogy between the old and new dispensation is marked by the Apostolic writers, when, in their native Judaic rhetoric, they speak of "the blood of sprinkling," and "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ;" obviously denoting the great idea of personal purification, through the moral influence of the blood of Christ.

The blood of Christ has a moral influence on the conscience and heart of mankind, because it expresses the great sacrifice which he made in their behalf. It was shed by violent hands while he was engaged in the merciful work of revealing God to men, and laboring to instruct and reform them, that they might be personally fitted for the salvation of an endless life. It is therefore an appeal to the universal heart, and adapted to awaken a universal echo of responsive gratitude. It is the voice of perfect love, claiming its recognition, and provoking a return. When seen as the sacrifice of love,—the love, not only of Him who bled, but of *Him who was imaged* in the bleeding humanity of the Christ, that heart must be callous indeed which is not stirred to its lowest depths, and does not offer itself a whole burnt offering on the high altar of its faith. In the presence of such a sacrifice the hardest heart should be propitiated, and the most determined enmity atoned or reconciled to God. It is because the blood of Christ is the manifestation of Divine love, that the sin of men is so great, and their punishment so deserved, when, by despising its touching utterance, they have virtually "trodden under foot the blood of Christ, . . , and done despite to the spirit of grace." For such, obviously, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries," because there is no greater sacrifice to be made,—no higher expression of Divine love to be given. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And as God has condescended to express his love to us through the mediation or medium of a man, he can only express even his own infinite emotion through such a finite medium. We are accustomed to regard the sacrifice of life as the greatest which one man can make in behalf of another; we always accept it as the most perfect evidence of a perfect love. If then such a sacrifice fails to convince the heart, and take it captive for God, then no other more potent sacrifice for the destruction of the heart's sins can be made,—"there remaineth (in the nature of things) no more sacrifice for (the conquest of) sins." The highest agency,—the most perfect and powerful means, has been put into operation, and if without effect, nothing more can be done. Christ pre-eminently is "the power of God for salvation," and if in the case of any he proves powerless, salvation is impossible,—the judgment of a just wrath must await the indurated soul, which has destroyed its natural instincts and holy sensibilities by sin. Are we wrong in surmising that herein lies the unpardonable sin,—the sin against the Holy Spirit of God,—breathing itself in beneficent fulness on the barren soul of the blasphemer of his love? No doubt the denial of the Divine love in the blood of Christ is *a* "blasphemy against the Holy Spirit," and its final perseverance *an* "unpardonable sin." For surely no greater offence can be given to God than to give the lie to this declaration of his love, after the revelations he has made concerning it; and no condition can be more hopeless than that which fails to feel the force of love, uttered with so much significant intensity.

If love cannot convert the heart to God, no other power can. Severity does but make the sinful soul still more stubborn in its sinfulness. If the Lamb of God taketh not away the sin of the world, no lion energy will do the mighty work. If the blood of Christ cleanseth not from all sin, every drop must be drained from the sinner's veins in vain. God knows humanity better than it knows itself, and he has declared his knowledge, that the true cleansing power, which can wash away all sin, is

Love. Hence he put this mighty moral force in operation when he "so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son" for it, and when it pleased him that his Son should be bruised for the purification of our iniquities, for "by his stripes we are healed," if healed at all of our spiritual disease;—we have "washed our robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," if the "robes" of our righteousness are really "washed" and "made white." Christ on the cross, because the full expression of the love of God is the true "Fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." Have we known by blessed experience the purifying and healing virtue of this "Fountain?" Have its sanctifying waters flowed in their purging course upon our consciences and lives,—destroying within us the sense and service of sin? Then indeed may we unite with the ransomed Church, in ascribing all the praise and glory "unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

Such being the moral significance and power of the Cross, or, which is the same thing, the blood, or death of Christ, it is apparent how it has become pre-eminently *the Atonement for Sin.* The word atonement,—it ought to be carefully remembered by all who would have clear and just views of this great subject,—is a word which, when employed by our translators of the English Bible, was used as the equivalent of the word *reconciliation*, as its etymology, as well as its usage in the New Testament, clearly establishes. It has now another, and widely different signification,—that of making amends for any thing, or any person,—a sense which it has derived through the much lamented prevalence of a most false and vicious scheme of theology in the Christian Churches. The literature of the word atonement will abundantly testify to the truth of our statement, when we affirm that it ought to be understood, in its New Testament use, as equivalent to Reconciliation. In the Old Testament it is the translation of a word which means to *cover*:—hence the phrase "to make atonement," is literally to *cover.* The idea is that of covering over sins by a gratuitous forgiveness, on certain conditions, which God represented by means of those sacred symbols of sacrifice which he instituted for the instruction of his ancient church. In Leviticus, chap. 17: 11, we read, "It is the *blood* that maketh an atonement for the soul,—literally, it is the blood that maketh a *covering* for the soul or person of the sinner. In New Testament phraseology we should read it thus: "It is the blood that maketh *reconciliation* for the soul or person." Understanding, then, the blood to be that of Christ, we have already seen how it operates as a moral drawing power on the heart of man, binding him in grateful allegiance to Christ, and through Christ, to God, so establishing a reconciliation, or at-one-ment, between man and God. Herein is the true reconciliation, or atonement, effected by the cross:—a reconciliation, be it carefully observed, *not of God to man*, but of *man to God.*

It is often overlooked that a very marked precision distinguishes the language of the sacred writers on the subject. They uniformly exhibit the reconciliation as looking towards *man*, and no towards God. It is *man* who needs to be reconciled or atoned, *not* God. "If when *we were enemies*," writes an Apostle, "*we* were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." "And having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him *to reconcile* all things *unto himself.* And *you*, who were sometimes *alienated*, and *enemies in your mind*, by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled*," (i. e. "*you.*") "That he might *reconcile both unto God* in one body by the cross, having *slain the enmity thereby*," (i. e. *man's enmity to God.*) "All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." "For if the casting away of the Jews be the reconciling of the world." "We pray you in Christ's stead, (for this was Christ's mission,) be ye reconciled to God."

In all these texts which we have quoted, to make apparent our statement, it will be observed that it is uniformly said that it is *man* who is at enmity with God, and who needs to be reconciled; and therefore it is in keeping with this representation that the Apostle Paul, in the *only* verse where the word atonement occurs in the New Testament, says that it is *man*, and *not* God, who has received the atonement. "And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom WE *have now received the atonement*," or reconciliation. The atonement of the Bible, then, is not the doing something to God as a compensation or satisfaction, but a doing something for man as a means of propitiating or reconciling him to his Maker. As represented in Scripture, it is the practical energy of a powerful persuasion,—an eloquent and heart-stirring appeal made by Christ, in the name of God, to mankind. It is atonement, not as a judicial satisfaction to God, but as a moral propitiation of man. It is the assault of a powerful love on the hearts of aliens and "enemies to God by wicked works." The heart that yields is reconciled, or atoned to God, and for that reason is the receiver of the atonement, or reconciliation. Thus Christ is "the propitiation for (or on account of) our sins." He propitiates *not* God, but *us*, because of our sins, which cause us to be at enmity with God. In order to accomplish our reconciliation, the Apostle Paul tells us that "God hath set Christ forth to be a propitiation, *through faith in his blood.*" He who has faith in Christ's blood,—who believes it to be the expression of his own and his Father's love for man, feels the power of that blood,—is conscious of its moral influence on his heart as a propitiating agency,—and by the eloquence of its condescending utterance, returns propitiated and penitent to his Father's house, saying, "Father I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son." Shall we not say with the beloved Apostle, in the contemplation of this wonderful scheme of atonement, or reconciliation, by the propitiatory blood of Christ, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

The reader, who may have accompanied us with some degree of distrust and anxiety in the outset of our inquiry into the proper scriptural significance of the cross of Christ, will, we presume, by

this time, see that we had no design to lower the appreciation of this great fact of Christian doctrine, but, on the contrary, to extricate it, so far as our abilities enable us, from that irrational and irreligious confusion by which it is enveloped in the popular faith. We cannot understand Christianity without the *cross*:—deprive it of this, and you dislocate the whole system of revealed truth, and render Christianity an imperfect and powerless thing. "Christ must *needs* have suffered and risen from the dead." He must "needs have suffered" for the perfection of his own example, and for the power of that persuasive eloquence which the cross pre-eminently possesses. Hence, we add to, rather than diminish, the force of our Lord's emphasis, when, after his resurrection, he said to his disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it *behoved* Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day."

In our view of the nature of the cross, and its value in the Christian system, it is an indispensable fact, inasmuch as it gathers to itself the highest practical influence of Christianity The cross, as we apprehend it, is a mighty moral power, indeed, *the* power which takes the heart captive, and trains it for the enjoyment and service of God. It is not a thing to tremble before in the paralysis of a sin-stricken fear, but a fact to feel grateful for, and whence to derive the inspiration of a generous faithfulness. On this account we need a cross in our notions of Christianity: we need, not only a Christ, but a "Christ *crucified*." A Christ without a cross might possibly be a human creation, but it could not possibly be the creation of God. It "must needs" be that Christ should have a cross,—in the very nature of things it could not be otherwise. It may be a "stumbling block" to the religious Jew, and "foolishness" to the philosophical Greek, because they know not the nature of highest virtue, and how it ever fares in our world; they know neither the perfection nor the omnipotence of love. But to God, and also "to them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ is the power of God, and the wisdom of God."

But we must not dismiss this grand subject without saying a word or two on the relation of the cross to the Forgiveness of Sins. In the popular scheme of theology, the cross of Christ was a judicial arrangement to make the forgiveness of sins possible, by transferring the punitive deserts of sin to a substitute. We pause not to expose what must be apparent on the least reflection,—the contradiction involved in the statement that sin is both punished and pardoned at the same time. We shall merely declare what, in our judgment, is the true relative position of the cross to the forgiveness of sins, and this may be set forth in very few words. As we apprehend the cross of the New Testament, it is the agency by which God effects the repentance and reformation of sinful men. It is a moral energy for subduing the heart's enmity, not an artificial equivalent to satisfy certain imaginary demands of inflexible law. The cross, if we understand its moral significance, does not *purchase* the sinner's pardon, but *prepares* him personally for it, by transforming his character, and making him the subject of holy dispositions and desires, Forgiveness is a gratuity on the simple conditions of faith and repentance,—faith in the message and mission of Christ as the necessary preliminary to repentance. It is a strange doctrine which represents forgiveness as impossible to God, and asserts his obligation to take vengeance on all sin, as well repented of, as not repented of. It is strange both to our moral sentiments and practice, and we think also strange to the Christianity of the Bible. God is not satisfied by taking vengeance on our sins, so much as by turning us away from the paths of vice. The cross was a satisfaction to him,—in it he was well pleased, because it possesses that power of persuasion which effectually redeems the sinner from the love and service of sin, and fits him to appreciate and profit by the grace of a free forgiveness. And thus the Apostle tells us that "according to the good pleasure of his will he hath made us accepted in the beloved; in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace."

Our view of the cross of Christ unites it indissolubly with the grace of forgiveness, for it makes faith in Christ, and, of course, in his cross, a prerequisite to being morally influenced thereby, so as to discover our own sinfulness, and need of salvation. Until we believe in Christ we do not place ourselves in that sympathetic relation to him which enables him to act upon us as "The fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." But as soon as we believe the heart-stirring facts of his mission, and the sacrifice he made in fulfilling it, those healing waters flow in upon our moral consciousness,—"His stripes," endured in our behalf, heal us of our sinful diseases,—his "blood" shed for us, "cleanses us from all sin." Thus the forgiveness of our sins, as well as every other Gospel blessing, is through the medial agency of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is both the bearer of this heavenly grace, and the begetter within us of that repentance which is the indispensable condition of its enjoyment. In the view of this two-fold relation of Christ, to the forgiveness of sins, a very considerable emphasis is imparted to the memorable words of the Forerunner of our Lord, "Behold the Lamb of God that *taketh away* the sin of the world."

Finally, the doctrine of the Atonement, as we have represented it, is no longer a dry speculative dogma of scholasticism, and a professional theology, but a practical matter of immense personal concernment. Instead of being a subject for occasional discourse, as among the abstruser mysteries of the Christian doctrine, it is brought forward into fore-ground prominence, as the grand burden of the Christian ministry, to all who are unreconciled to God. So at least Paul viewed it. He calls the Christian ministry the "ministry of atonement." The term "reconciliation," which, as we have before observed, is the same in meaning as atonement, may be used interchangeably with that word. It occurs in its verbal and nominal forms in 2 Cor. 5: 18–20, and the same Greek word is used there as in Romans 5: 11, where it is translated "atonement." By substituting the word "atonement" in the passage first mentioned, the

force of our remark about the practical prominence of the doctrine of atonement in the Christian ministry will be apparent. Paul there says "All things are of God, who hath *atoned* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us *the ministry of atonement*, namely, that God was in Christ *atoning* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us *the word* [doctrine] *of atonement*. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye *atoned* to God." "For," to paraphrase his words which are so extensively misunderstood, "God hath given him, who committed no sin, to be set forth a propitiatory offering for us, that we, being propitiated by him, might, through his moral agency, become workers of the righteousness of God." The true Christian preacher persuades men to be reconciled to God, by representing to them the greatness of the Divine love to sinners, of which the cross of Christ is the highest expression. He shows how

> God's beseeching voice is here,
> Bidding hence all servile fear;
> Breathing forth its tenderest strains,
> In words of blood, in dying pains.

And when sinners so interpret the high significance of the cross,—when it is to them "as though God did *beseech* them" by the soul-stirring eloquence of blood, shed to serve and save them,—and when yielding to this eloquent appeal, their sinful hostility is subdued, and they become humble suppliants at the footstool of mercy,—*then* is the atonement, or reconciliation accomplished,—*then* is it actually made for the individual sinner. Its historic occurrence is *then*, when the sinner yields to the moral power of the cross, and, repenting of his sins, becomes reconciled or atoned to God. To us there is no mystery in the atonement, other than its own intrinsic mystery of love. And other than this we know of no Christian atonement. The Gordian knot of the "extent of the atonement," as it is theologically phrased, is easily untied by the simple theory which we advocate. It extends just so far as it is effectual in reconciling sinners to God through Christ. Every addition to the true church of repenting sinners is a new extension of the atonement, and when sinners cease to be recovered and reconciled to God, the atonement halts in its Divine work of conciliation, and awaits a further extension among men.

Would that the preachers of Christianity knew that the "ministry of atonement" was committed to them, and, instead of disputing about the extent of a fancied satisfaction, sought to extend the atoning agency of Christ, by proclaiming that "God was in Christ atoning the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them!" Would that, throwing aside the false and mischievous speculations which they mistakenly designate the atonement, they would startle the slumbering sinner, by assuring him that as yet no atonement has been made between him and his Maker!—that the cross of Christ is ever seeking to effect that atonement,—and that unless atoned now, while the day of grace surrounds him with its golden sun-light, he must die un-atoned, and share the destruction of those who perish everlastingly!

Men know not that the bleeding Christ is the image of a beseeching God,—that the cross is the loud cry of Almighty compassion. The atonement in its sublimest and most powerful ministry, is not yet administered but on a very limited scale. Now that the world has almost lived its Christian history, and the signs of the times indicate that the Son of Man is nigh at hand, even at the doors,—theological men are beginning to discover this long lost ministry of love, and beginning to apply it! But it is as yet a mooted point: the popular churches have not yet recognized it, and the few that have are cast out as reprobates and heretics! Before we can hope to see "the ministry of atonement" in active operation in the churches of our land, it must pass into favor with the spiritual sanhedrim, and receive the broad seal of authority of the high priests and scribes of Christendom. More than eighteen hundred years ago, Christ sealed it with his own blood, and nearly as long ago the Apostles published to the world that God had committed unto them "the word or doctrine of atonement," to preach as the grand burden of their Christian ministry to all who were still unreconciled to God. And now the churches deny this trust, and instead of preaching an atonement that has power to woo the heart, and work the reformation of the life, they teach mankind a theological tradition, which shocks the moral sentiments, and has no influence, save a detrimental one, on the masses of society. Christ, when he expired on the cross, kindled a fire in the world to burn up its enmities, and bend the iron stubbornness of the soul into a grateful and willing service; but religious men have cooled it down by their crude conceits till now it is at the very zero of spiritual efficiency. The cross, which is the most wonderful illustration, among the wonderful works of God, of his skill in bringing good out of evil, and making the wrath of man to minister to his praise, has been distorted by the theology of the popular churches, into the most awful tragedy which the world has ever been called to gaze on,—a tragedy in which the benignant Father himself is represented in the most revolting character,—a character which we cannot love,—which neither our instincts nor the principles of the religion of Christ will permit us to love. The cross, which, in the theology of the New Testament, is so unequivocally proclaimed to be "the power of God" for the conversion of men, is, through the theology of the churches, their greatest perplexity. That which was designed to reconcile us to God has been perverted into an instrument to repel men from one another,—to foment prejudice, party-feeling, and even violent persecution! Of what wrongs and wickedness has not the cross been made the symbol and servant! When it was erected into a power, it was made the power of violence, and bloodshed, and murderous wars; and now that the traditions of men have made it almost "of none effect" for evoking the heart's repentance and reverence towards God, it stands as the dry-rot of the church, nourishing nothing but the decay of the church's vitality, and Christian brotherhood. God grant that Christendom may perish, may yet again be lifted voices of thousands of "grace, grace unto it!"

ÆTERNITAS

BY REV. WM.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or. Glimpses of Man*: By Wm

[Continued fr

And while thus oblige of the words, "neither ca the regenerated,—to the immense consolation. I are not ignorant of this vers bearings, it is the st future deathlessness, del which we rest our highes our fortress of immovabl to stand upon that no They can die no more. will die no more; the "c affirmation that ought to titude to Him who broug to light through the Go leave the expression, for ten rock in the wildernes tant future as with rosy us its illuminations as we pulchre, among the ruin contemplate the time-futu vion seems every hour ab at any moment it may; faithful disciple, on yond down the valley of futu cloudless; while ever and the spangled firmament archangel tuned his harp, jubilee, of which in the resurrected frame, you ha and the proof, "neither ca

Thus we have endeavo throw those lines of reas Mr. Bathgate in defence passage from Luke affirms mortality. We have ma our author for the sake teaching, and after all w clare that his argumenta vigor as the whole system factory proof. And we m memory the fact that the him commenting upon, and evidence of the deathless has not one word about s ment to its close. To pr have quoted with equal heavens and the earth we host of them."

The more that the reade doctrine of soul, as already one of this series of papers, ly endorse our assertions co and absolute worthlessnes

erhood. God grant that the cross of our corrupt Christendom may perish, that *the cross of Christ* may yet again be lifted up before men, and the voices of thousands of grateful hearts ascribe "grace, grace unto it!"

ÆTERNITAS REVIEWED.

BY REV. WM. G. MONCRIEF.

"ÆTERNITAS: *or. Glimpses of the Future Destinies of Man*: By WM. BATHGATE."

[Continued from page 164.]

And while thus obliged to restrict the bearings of the words, "neither can they die any more," to the regenerated,—to them they are replete with immense consolation. In our judgment, and we are not ignorant of this great question in its divers bearings, it is the strongest assertion of their future deathlessness, delivered in that word on which we rest our highest expectations. This is our fortress of immovable stability; it is ground to stand upon that no earthquake can disturb. They can die no more. It is not even said they will die no more; the "can" gives a power to the affirmation that ought to excite our boundless gratitude to Him who brought light and immortality to light through the Gospel. One can scarcely leave the expression, for it refreshes like the smitten rock in the wilderness. It irradiates the distant future as with rosy beams, and flings towards us its illuminations as we journey towards the sepulchre, among the ruins of mortality. As we contemplate the time-future, its blackness of oblivion seems every hour about to descend on us, and at any moment it may; but imagine yourself, O faithful disciple, on yonder side the grave; look down the valley of futurity then, and it is all cloudless; while ever and anon you may hear from the spangled firmament over your head, as if an archangel tuned his harp, the words of triumphant jubilee, of which in the incorruptibility of your resurrected frame, you have at once the meaning and the proof, "neither can they die any more."

Thus we have endeavored to meet and overthrow those lines of reasoning brought forth by Mr. Bathgate in defence of his position that the passage from Luke affirms a universal human immortality. We have made great concessions to our author for the sake of doing justice to his teaching, and after all we are compelled to declare that his argumentation is as destitute of vigor as the whole system he upholds is of satisfactory proof. And we must now bring back to memory the fact that the verses we have found him commenting upon, and whence he would evolve evidence of the deathlessness of all human souls, has not one word about souls from its commencement to its close. To prove his point he might have quoted with equal propriety, "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them."

The more that the reader understands the true doctrine of soul, as already partially developed in one of this series of papers, he will the more readily endorse our assertions concerning the imbecility and absolute worthlessness of the argument in "Æternitas," on behalf of the common dogma of human immortality, derived from the conversation of our Lord with the Sadducees. One, yes *one*, though only one passage was promised us about man's immortality, as our author delivers it; and lo, the one is an empty vessel,—a hollow delusion. He builds up a plea, and an infant's hand might pull it down, for it is only an erection of cards. And in such a fabric poor old orthodoxy was to find shelter from the storms of indignation at his position. The writer ought to have been more considerate, unless, which is not to be imagined, he had had some evil design of exposing the hoary deceiver to a tempest in which it was foreseen he would totter and expire. Many long for that hour, for he has practiced his cunning arts before the church and the nations so long and so well, as nearly to eclipse the glory of Him who is the revealer of immortality, and at the same time the resurrection and the life. It is time he were dead,—we don't mean disembodied,—but literally defunct, and consigned to the grave.

Though not logically necessitated to examine the 37th and 38th verses of the chapter before us, whence the "one" passage for immortality was promised us, it may be useful to glance at them for a little, as they are misunderstood by the author, and by very many along with him. Perhaps the simplest plan is to present a brief exposition of them, taking up any difficulties as we go along, either suggested by Mr. B., or others, with whose writings we happen to be acquainted. And first let us again quote the verses, that they may lie before the reader's view.

Ver. 37. Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

Ver. 38. For he is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto Him.

We begin by remarking upon the 37th verse. It will be observed, then, in the 36th verse our Lord had asserted that resurrection was not merely possible, but something yet actually to happen, at any rate to parties therein described by their moral qualities. Its reality depends, up to that stage in his reply to the Sadducees, on his authority alone, and, of course, with all who admit him to be the Messiah, that is a sufficient basis for it to be placed upon. But as he was not conversing with those who allowed his claims, it was important to meet their objections in a way more fitted to gain their consent. Personal authority with them could go for little when they were not believers in Jesus; but they might see the force of an argument drawn from Moses, in whose testimony they had confidence. From Jesus, therefore, the question is carried to the Hebrew legislator,—the question is fair, and the tribunal is acknowledged. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush," or the words which Moses affirms he heard from the bush, proved the dead are raised, or that there is to be a resurrection of the dead. The Sadducees, we are informed, denied "any resurrection;" they also rejected the existence of angels and spirits. They were not atheists, but while they had faith in God they

were believers in the unity and materiality of man, they also held that at death it is over with each human agent forever. That the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground,—that in death there is no remembrance of God, or any one else—that the dead know not anything, was their creed in reference to humanity, and it would be difficult to prove they were anti-scriptural on these points. They erred in this, however: they not merely affirmed that in death remembrance was gone, but that it was gone forever: in short, that a man, when once prostrated by the king of terrors, could never live again. They rejected the future life altogether, seeing, as far as their eye reached, no evidence of resurrection, and perhaps deeming it speculatively an impossibility that life could ever be restored to the children of corruption. They had no faith in intermediate states, purgatories, limbos, or any such localities, with their attenuated denizens. With them death was a palpable and terrible reality,—a going out of the lamp,—a snapping of the thread of life; the lamp never to be re-kindled, the thread never again to be re-joined. Our Lord purposes to prove to these men that existence could be restored, and that even in the Scriptures which they revered,—the writings of Moses,—it was prophetically intimated in language which was not too dark for an ordinary apprehension. As soon as he pointed out the argument, the effect of it was acknowledged by those who were auditors of the dispute. "When the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine."—Matt. 22: 33. "The scribes answering said, "Master thou hast well said."—Luke 20: 39; and the very Sadducees themselves were put to silence.—Matt. 22: 34.

It has been said, though the Sadducees believed in the entire destruction of man in death, there is no need to suppose that our Lord had the same idea in his mind concerning the deceased, when he uttered the words, "Now that the dead are raised." In other words, it is affirmed, that our Lord held it was only of "bodies" that a resurrection could be predicated,—souls not needing it, being in themselves incapable of extinction. But our Lord says nothing, either here or anywhere else, about souls being exempt from mortality. Moreover, the universal teaching of Scripture is, that the soul of a man is just the man himself, whom the Lord God originally formed of the dust of the ground. Further, he says, "Now that the dead,"—not dead bodies, but the dead, i, e., dead men, are raised. They are dead, and they are dead as men. He is to prove not that men never die, but that dead, extinct men shall live anew by the power of God; he has already answered who are to be incapable of death a second time, beyond the resurrection hour; he now simply grapples with the Sadducean error that resurrection would not,—could not possibly take place. It even matters little whether many or few are to rise; let resurrection be proven as a thing destined by God to happen, and the removal of objections to the resurrection of one carries away difficulties from the mind of a Sadducee as to the resurrection of any number who may be appointed to resume consciousness activity.

Once more, the present tense is in this clause employed for the future,—a figure of speech with which we are familiar in the sacred writings.—"The dead are raised," i. e., are to be raised, or will rise. Our Lord is not to prove that the resurrection of the dead has taken place, but that they will rise at a future time. Some are of opinion, like the Swedenborgians, that the resurrection occurs at death, or that the going away of the "soul" or "spirit" from its fleshly abode is the resurrection of Scripture; and, of course, they hold that when this disembodiment and translation happens men are done with materiality and its experiences forever afterwards. This, we can only afford time to observe, is just the popular idea very slightly modified, and perhaps exhibited in a more consistent form than we are accustomed to find in the volumes of the self-styled orthodox: and it is a doctrine which can be no more received by the man who understands the Bible doctrine that the "soul" is just the human being himself,—that his "spirit" is the life-breath which animates his form, than the common theory, or any conceivable modification of it.

The proof of resurrection is,—"Moses showed at the bush that the dead are raised," when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, &c. The Sadducees had already appealed to Moses (v. 28,) and the Savior leads them again to their own favorite authority, as we have already observed. The common opinion, approved by our author, is that these renowned patriarchs were not dead, but at that hour, when the dispute took place, as truly in consciousness as when they were pilgrims on the face of the globe. But the Savior classes Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob among the "dead;" and, indeed, if they were not dead, what need had they of a resurrection? The Sadducees affirmed that men, once lifeless, would never be revived by Divine power; and our Lord's intention was to show that the very doctrine rejected by them was indirectly announced by the voice that Moses heard at the bush. They could not be dead and alive at the same time,—needing a resurrection, and yet not requiring it; in heaven and in the grave at the same moment! Save the Bible from such absurdities, and fill creeds and commentaries with them to the brim, if you please. The patriarchs must be held to be dead in the plain sense of the term. Their spirit—their life-breath had gone forth. They had returned to their dust, and in that very day their thoughts had perished: they had joined the great company of the silent and the unconscious in the land of darkness:—they were as if they had never been. What do we read of their decease? Does it countenance the delusion that death had been to them a "blissful friend," or a relentless foe? How sound the records? "Then Abraham gave up the ghost,"—expired, "and *died* in a good old age, and full of years; and was gathered to his people. And his sons Isaac and Ishmael *buried him* in the cave of Macpelah, in the field of Ephron, the son of Zohar, the Hittite."—Gen. 25: 7; 8. "These all [Abraham, &c.] died in faith, NOT HAVING RECEIVED THE PROMISES, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and con-

fessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." "These all, having obtained a good report through faith, RECEIVED NOT THE PROMISE, God having provided some better thing for us, THAT THEY WITHOUT US SHOULD NOT BE MADE PERFECT."—Heb. 11 : 13, 39, 40. It seems then most proper to use the words of Peter about David with application to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. "They are not ascended into the heavens," —"They are both dead and buried, and their sepulchres are with us unto this day." Here, then, are men in the exact position whence the Sadducees affirmed they never would, or need be taken. Shall these dead men live anew? Yes, for God is still their God. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac," &c. What is it to be a God to them? How does the intimation he is yet their God evolve the Savior's position, that they would yet be resurrected from the arms of the grave?

TRUTH ADVANCING.—The following *Response* by the Editor of the *Christian Advocate*—organ of the Methodist E. Church, in this city—to a correspondent in that paper May 4th, we hail as a *return* to the Bible, which is cheering, and indicates an abandonment of pagan philosophy for the only source of information in relation to a future life. The Bible is where we have ever desired to meet the opposers of the doctrine of immortality and eternal life *only* through Jesus Christ as a *gift* of God to the *holy alone*, and conferred at the resurrection of the just, in the last day.

The Editor of the Christian Advocate—DR. BOND—speaks thus :—

We have deeply felt the importance of the subjects to which our correspondent refers : "The relations of the spiritual to the material world, and the disposition made of the soul on its separation from the body." We have consulted philosophy and philosophers in regard to these subjects with no success. Philosophy, applied to spiritual things, constitutes what is called natural theology, and from natural theology is derived what is called natural religion. Now natural theology must be derived from natural phenomena ; that is, from the works of creation, as they are exhibited to our senses, and from the providential government and superintendence manifested in these works. Both in antiquity and modern times men of the greatest ability, and most patient industry, have inquired of the phenomena of nature and providence, and have ended in nothing but vain speculations in respect to spiritual things. Their theories are vain imaginations, unsupported by proof which carries conviction to the judgment, or satisfaction to the longings of human nature after sure and certain hope in respect to the future.

At the very threshold of the temple of knowledge, the philosophers of both ancient and modern times have met with an insurmountable obstacle to their progress. They could not proceed a single step without answering the inquiry, Has man an immaterial spirit in him—something distinct from, and capable of existing independently of matter? They found the opinion everywhere prevalent that he had ; but how did it originate? Tradition had handed down the belief from the earliest ages, but mixed up with the most puerile conceits, and absurd superstitions. Could it stand the test of philosophical inquiry? One thing was perceived at the outset. The question as to the existence of spirit could not be subjected to ordinary philosophical tests. Philosophy examined matter, its qualities and laws, as it was presented to the senses ; but spirit was neither tangible nor visible—was not cognizant of any sense. How, then, could its existence be demonstrated? If any attempted to demonstrate the existence of spirit by the operations of mind, the argument was met by the objection that no one was so well and accurately acquainted with the powers of which matrial organization was capable, as to be assured that no peculiarity of organization was competent to perform functions attributed to the mind. It was not more inscrutable than the *thinking* of subordinate animals, and the functions which are performed by what is called life in vegetables. It excelled these in degree, but so might human organization excel in degree all other forms of life.

But if philosophy could not demonstrate the existence of an immaterial spirit in man, it could not assure us of a future state of existence, and consequently could not reconcile the existence of moral and physical evil in the world with the omnipotence and Goodness of God ; for it was evident that a good man, possessed of omnipotence, would not have made a world like this, where no degree of excellence could exempt a man from the evils of life—from pestilence, famine, oppression, pain, bereavments, and death. It was true, then, as Paul declared in his day, that "the world by wisdom (i. e., philosophy) knew not God," and it is true still. They could not assure themselves of his unity, much less of his omnipotence and moral attributes comprehended in the word *goodness*. On the contrary, when they contemplated the moral and physical evil existing in the world, and viewed the apparently unjust administration of providence, they could come to no other conclusion than that there existed both good and evil deities, mutually counteracting each other in the government of the world. True, they could not contemplate the phenomena of creation without perceiving evidence of *intelligence* and *power* in the works and in the government of creation. These attributes were evident—everywhere seen. They were apparent in the movements of the heavenly bodies by fixed and invariable laws, and the structure of the smallest insect testified to the same intelligence and power by the adaptation of its organization to the purposes of its economy. But whether this intelligence and power resided in one God, or in many gods, philosophy could not decide. And, indeed, had it decided on unity as a divine attribute, the other attributes of intelligence and power would have afforded no basis for religion, as they would have taught nothing which could direct man how to worship and serve the Creator so as to procure his favor.

With these views we renounce, wholly, all reliance upon metaphysical theology, and consequent-

ly upon natural religion, and betake ourself solely and exclusively to revealed theology and religion, as found in the Holy Scriptures. We have settled the only question which remained to be answered after philosophy failed us; namely, Are the Scriptures true? Do they contain a revelation from God to man? We find their truth attested by evidence which our judgment cannot resist;—demonstration as satisfactory as the Q. E. D. of Euclid; "They have God for their author, salvation for their end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for their matter. Here, then, we rest our faith and our hope, in all spiritual concerns. Our only business now is to inquire, What has God said? what does he require? what does he promise? what does he threaten? With John Wesley, we are *homo unius libri*,—"a man of one book"—in regard to the interests of the soul for time and eternity; and, "looking into the perfect law of liberty, and continuing therein, not being a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, we are happy in our deed."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JUNE 15, 1854.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.—As Br. Ham's articles on "*The Cross of Christ*" have now all appeared in the BIBLE EXAMINER, and as considerable controversy has arisen and more may arise, we deem it our duty to say a few words more on the subject.

We do not endorse all the positions of either side in this controversy. We believe *the death* of Christ was *necessary* to deliver dying men from sin and *death*: that without it the world would not have had a *Deliverer*, and all would have perished without hope. But we do not believe that his death by *crucifixion* was either planned by God, approved by Him, or necessary to redeem man. Nor do we believe the Son of God died one moment sooner for being *nailed to the cross*. By causing him to be crucified the Jews displayed their malice and wickedness, and were justly chargable with being his betrayers and murderers, as the *design* and *intention* constitutes the crime. But the Jews did not actually take away his life, nor was it in their power to do so, any more than they could hold him in the tomb when buried.

In support of our position we have first the testimony of Jesus himself—"No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." When hung upon the cross, it is evident that his death was not caused by the crucifixion. Pilate marvelled that he was so soon dead. He dismissed himself from life. The hour of his death was to be the hour of offering the *Possover* lamb; that was the hour for the glorious anti-type to offer himself up in death for our redemption. Till then his "hour" had "not come;" then it had come; and then he would have died even if no "wicked hands" had been there. But God suffered wicked men to manifest their wickedness on the occasion, and thereby his death was notorious to all, and his resurrection made the more certain by the pains his enemies took to prevent his disciples from "stealing him away."

Jesus' *death*, then, was a necessary event, and he would most certainly have died without any human intervention; as no such intervention did or could take away his life. He laid it down of *himself*. The *crucifixion* was not necessary: it was not planned of God, nor required as an act to constitute Jesus such a Deliverer as perishing men needed. The crucifixion was a wicked act, and all concerned in it were wicked men who committed the foulest crime. The act was never approved of God, and of course never made necessary for the redemption of men. The fact that prophecy foretold the death of Christ by acts of wicked men, no more proves that God planned His Son's death by crucifixion than that He planned and designed the abomination, called Papacy, because prophecy foretold it.

Jesus *died*; that is a glorious truth. Jesus *rose* from the dead is another glorious truth. But wicked men no more *actually* killed Christ, than good men actually raised him from the dead. Wicked men disclosed their murderous hearts in nailing him to the cross—but they had no power to take away his life. Jesus himself has forever set that fact at rest—"No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself." He reached our lost estate by descending under death where we all lay, and by his resurrection brought life and immortality to light: thanks, eternal thanks to God and the Lamb.

"THE WORLD OF WOE."

The American Messenger, published by the Am. Tract Soc., for May, makes the following remarks:—

"*The Justice of Endless Punishment*, for the sins of time, is often denied by men, because they reject the testimony of the Bible as to the evil of sin against an infinitely holy and just God, and because they think only of the sins of time. But man will go on sinning through eternity, and will deserve to be punished through eternity. In the world of woe, man will be freed from all the restraints that here keep him back from sin, and will be forever given up to all evil passions and influences, and therefore will never cease to sin, It is evident that as long as a sinner continues to add to his sins, God's justice will require his continued,

his *endless* punishment. Shall we presume to say that God's standard and sentence are not just? How much wiser to acknowledge the justice of our condemnation, and looks to *Christ* for pardon."

The Scriptures teach us that men are to "receive," when "the Son of Man shall come in his glory, according to their works, . . . *in the body*." Compare Matt. 16 : 27, with 2 Corth. 5 : 10. To talk about men being punished for sins under a system of government where they cannot avoid sinning—shut up to the necessity of wickedness—is to represent the inflictor of the punishment as the most outrageous tyrant and monster conceivable : and, besides, there is not a single "Thus saith the Lord," to support such a monstrous sentiment, found in the Bible : it is a pure *assumption* and "fable."

The same paper, in another article, says, "No mere apprehension of danger ever effectually leads to holiness. Men cannot be frightened out of their sins."

That is truth : and not only so, but threatening a punishment, manifestly opposed to reason—as endless misery is—is the most *effectual* way to harden men in sin, and engender *hatred* instead of *love*. The natural result of the doctrine contained in the foregoing defence of "*endless woe*" is to make thinking men abhor the being who is supposed to design such a punishment for sin.

The same number of the *Messenger* has in it a story of a "*cruel boy*," that began his career by tormenting and killing flies and little animals : and asks, "Was he not very cruel?" At length he arrived at such a pitch of love for cruelty, that "He enjoyed cruel sports of all kinds; and the groans and sufferings of his fellow creatures afforded him rich entertainment."

What better is the *Demon*—for we will not say *God*—of the "endless woe" of the *American Messenger*? We fearlessly reply that "*Nero*" was a saint to him. For Nero *killed* his victims in the end; but the *Demon* of "endless woe" is supposed to have the power and the disposition to protract the life of his victim to unending ages, and to be constantly increasing the anguish of the sufferer : and no sorrow or pain of the miserable being is ever to move the demon-god to relax, or show pity.

No wonder "Nero's subjects grew weary of him, and condemned him to be thrown from the Tarpeian rock and dashed to pieces." Such was a deserved fate.

But we rejoice to know that the view taken of endless punishment, in the *Messenger*, is totally unsustained by the Bible, and the God of the Bible is not to be charged with such blasphemous teaching.

Again the *Messenger* says—speaking of "Repentance unto Life,"—"He who will not be won by love, cannot be saved." That is truth. Why then attempt to win men by the blasphemous teaching of "endless woe?" It never did and never can win a soul of man to repentance, or draw them to God.

In the article about the "cruel boy," the *Messenger* inquires, "Does any child think that the great God, whose tender mercies are over all his works, and who watches the dying sparrows, will not be very angry with all those who in any way abuse his creatures?"

Truly! But how irreconcilable is the last view of God with the previous one, which represents the same God as inflicting "endless woe," on the "creatures" He has made; and under circumstances, too, where it is impossible for them to reform; or, if they should, He would in no case liberate them from their pains?

Must not that "God, whose tender mercies are over all his works . . . be angry with those who in any way" represent Him as giving life to innumerable beings whom He determines to make immeasurably and eternally wretched and miserable?

QUESTIONS.

Br. Storrs :—I wish to ask you a few questions, and should be glad to have you answer them. 1. What was it that was closed up and sealed till the time of the end? 2. What was it the wise shall understand? 3. What are the periods of time in the Bible for, if we are to know nothing about the time of Christ's coming? There is so many different opinions that I want to know yours. Some think the church is now in the wilderness, and the signs have none of them appeared. Yours, in love, looking for immortality in Jesus Christ,

Lisbon, N. H. IRA QUIMBY.

REPLY OF THE EDITOR.—1. That which "was closed up and sealed till the time of the end" was the "*words*" which related to "*the end* of these things" which had been the subject of the previous prophecy.

2. "The wise shall understand" the "*words*" spoken of, when the "time of the end" shall arrive.

3. "The poriods of time in the Bible" relate to events of which we can "know" something; but it remains yet to be proved that any *symbolic* period relates to the *precise time* of Christ's "coming." We are not convinced by anything that we have ever yet seen that there is any evidence of a symbolic period—"day for a year"—being given

us for the second coming of Christ. We believe, from the best light we have, at present, that the 1290 and 1335 days of Daniel 12th are *literal* days, and yet in the future. Our reasons for that belief we stated in the Examiner several years since. They are briefly these: Daniel 10th, 11th and 12th is one chain of *historic* prophecy, not *symbolic*. Hence there is no reason for regarding the "days" in the 12th chapter as symbols of years. Besides, the original term for days in that chapter is the same as that used in the 10th, where the personage that appeared to Daniel—after he had fasted "*three* full weeks"—said, "The Prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me *one and twenty days*." Here no one doubts that literal days are meant. Why, then, in the same discourse, shall we suppose the same term is employed to signify *years*? and that too when no other part of that discourse is symbolical? and especially as the word translated *days* is not the same that is used Dan. 8th, "2300 days."

We are at present decidedly of the opinion, that the time in Dan. 12th relates to the period of a personal Anti-Christ, yet to be developed, who will constitute "the abomination that astonisheth," and continue in his glory for the number of literal days spoken of in that chapter. Then may "the wise understand" even the *time* of their deliverance, and will more earnestly long for it than has ever yet been realized by any previous saints. Dr. Kitto, under the head of "*Anti-Christ*," says:—

"*Justin Martyr*, in his *Dialogues with Trypho*, describes him as exercising his wrath against christians with special fury in the period immediately preceding the Second Advent. *Cyril* of Jerusalem repsesents him as reigning *three years and six months* preparatory to the entire destruction of his dominion at the second coming of Christ; and says, he will deceive both Jews and Gentiles; the former, by representing himself as the Messiah; the latter by his magical arts and incantations. St. Chrysostom observes, on 2 Thes. 2: that Anti-Christ will not lead men to idolatory, but will rather abolish the worship of false gods, as well as that of the true God, commanding the world to worship *himself alone* as the only Deity."

We are inclined to the view that the developement of the real Anti-Christ will be Atheism enthroned, perhaps in all the governments of earth, and possibly the Papal head will take that form. The Prince of the power of the air has tried all forms of religion to cheat and destroy men—paganism, with all its forms of idolatry till they were exhausted in their popularity—then he transformed paganism into Papacy, and has used that till it has become an abhorrence to all reasoning men; and his last dying efforts will be to enthrone Atheism; or a rejection of "all that is called God, or that is worshipped." Papacy hitherto has not answered this description, though it has shadowed it forth and prepared the way for it. "*The* Anti-Christ" is clearly described by John in his First Epistle, chap. 2, verse 22; "He is [*the*] anti-christ that denieth the Father and the Son." The emphatic "*the*" is in the original. There are and have been, "many anti-christs;" but there is to be revealed *one* who is emphatically "*the* anti-christ;" and John clearly designates him as a denier of "*the Father and the Son*." Such has not been, hitherto, the character of Papacy: it may possibly yet assume it, to adapt itself to the spirit of Atheism that is now spreading in Europe with awful power.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor:—Granting you every thing you desire in the statement of the question, I proceed at once with the argument.

To prove that man has a spirit, distinct from his body, I have proposed to show first that such entities as spirits exist; and to show that there are spirits in the universe, unconnected with material forms or organs, I allege, upon the authority of the Bible, that God is such a spirit. Of the relevancy of this argument our readers must judge. I am talking of GOD the ETERNAL SPIRIT, as you must have known; and if you choose to run off upon the term "composed" to write about a *created* spirit, while I am writing about JEHOVAH, our readers will doubtless infer the true reason.

But let me call you back to my argument. I affirm that "God is a *pure spirit*, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible; and unconnected with bodily form or organs." My scripture proof is John 4: 24, "GOD IS A SPIRIT." I affirm that this point is vital to my argument, and invite you to either admit it, or deny and controvert it. And you respond that it is "irrelevant." Strange that the question whether spirit ever exists separate from matter has no bearing upon the question of man's spiritual nature. If God is a spirit immaterial and uncompounded, then there is at least *one* purely spiritual being in the universe; and the question of the possibility of the existence of a spirit, conscious, intelligent, and active, without connection with matter, is settled beyond all cavil. Besides, the determination of this point will settle the question as to the *nature* of spirit. Please, then, to meet my argument frankly and fairly or leave it to its legitimate office in the discussion.

But you seem, after all, to feel the force of this "irrelevant" fact. And to escape it you virtually deny it. This you do when you affirm that the

doctrine of the immateriality of God "*is a pure assumption*, without a particle of Scripture authority;" and also where you speak of "the Pof.'s *notion* of a spiritual nature" as something that you do not believe. For you well know what my "notion" of the spiritual nature of God is, viz: that he is a *pure spirit*, unconnected with a material form or organs. And by controverting this "notion," so distinctly and fully avowed, you take the position that God is a material being.

This is what I expected. For whoever denies that consciousness, thought and intelligence can exist separate from a material organization, must either deny that God is a conscious and intelligent being, or deny his pure spirituality, and invest him with material organs. You adopt the latter alternative; and in the face of one of the most direct, explicit, and unequivocal statements in all the Bible, going to show that God is a spirit, you controvert this "notion," and avow your belief that he is matter! And you even assert that the Bible does not teach the contrary!! Pray, then, tell me what is the meaning of the declaration, "*God is a* SPIRIT." Are spirit and matter the same? And will you assert that God is a *material being*, in the face of the declaration of Christ that he is a "SPIRIT?"

Leaving you to meet my first argument as you best can, I affirm—

2. *That the "holy angels," so often spoken of in the Bible, are spirits, and not material beings.* "Who maketh his angels SPIRITS," Psa. 104: 4. "Are they not all ministering SPIRITS," Heb. 1: 14. These passages as plainly assert that the holy angels are spirits as human language could do. As God is a spirit, and is so revealed to us, so the angels are revealed to us as spirits also. In this respect God and angels are alike, as purely spiritual entities, unconnected with bodily forms or organs.

Here, then, we have, not a solitary specimen of purely spiritual existence, but "legions of angels," yea, "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands."

3. *The fallen angels or devils of the Bible are still spiritual entities, without material bodies.* It will not be denied that their most common designation in the New Testament is "spirits," "unclean spirits," &c. And these spirits, (which are also designated as devils,) not only "possessed" and dwelt in the bodies of men and women, but they talked through their lips, and otherwise controled their bodies, grievously tormenting them. Moreover, they were often "cast out" of the human bodies they had usurped, by Christ and his disciples; and in one instance they entered by permission, into the bodies of a herd of swine.

That these malign beings that could dwell in human bodies, and think and speak, and go in and out, and from one body to another, were really *spirits* as the scriptures declare them to be, requires no further proof. If they were material bodies, then all spirits may be bodies, even the Eternal Spirit himself. And besides: If they were bodies, then we have two bodies occupying the same space, at the same time, which is impossible.

I submit, then, as my first argument, in proof of the *existence* of spiitual entities, the existence of a GOD who is a spirit, and of holy angels and devils, who are also spirits. H. MATTISON.

—

Response by the Editor.

We regret that Prof. Mattison did *not* "proceed at once with the argument," and not leave it in an attempt to discuss the nature of God. We submit to our readers whether that item is embraced in the question at issue. We will not discuss the nature of God with any man. "I AM THAT I AM," and "He that cometh to God must believe that HE IS" [that He exists,] "and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." His essential nature He has never seen fit to reveal; and, in our judgment, it is the height of presumption to attempt to scan it. He "is a Spirit." What do men know of the properties of spirit; especially of the Eternal and Uncreated Spirit? Just nothing at all: and we neither affirm nor deny in that matter, and our friend can spare himself the pains of asserting what we believe on that point.

Suppose it were admitted that God is immaterial, uncompounded, &c., will that prove that *created* beings might be so too? No more than the fact that God is *uncreated* proves that there may be other uncreated beings: one position is just as inadmissible as the other. We might oppose to the Prof.'s assumption of the nature of God, that He showed His "*back* parts" to Moses, and that He "*eat*" of Abraham's "fatted calf," &c., which looks quite as though He may be some how connected with *materiality*. But we think both the Prof. and ourself had better stand off from such "holy ground" as the discussion of the nature of God, and attend to the question at issue.

The Prof. next descends to angels, who, he says, are "not material beings," and are "unconnected with bodily forms or organs." This is another pure *assumption*. It is assuming that because some beings are called "spirits" that they must answer to *his definition* of spirit. Now that his definition of spirit, when applied to angels, is an assumption is evident, to our mind, from the fact that those beings often appeared to men and *eat* with them, of bread, meat and milk—see the case of Abraham, Lot, and others. Strange work, that for beings "unconnected with bodily form or organs!" They did eat or they did not. If they did not, then they were *hypocrites*, for they pretended to eat. If they did eat, then they had "organs" and were connected with materiality in some form. And the Psalmist saith "man did eat angels food," when manna was eaten in the wilderness. But the question of the precise nature of angels,

whether good or bad, we will not discuss at this time. It will be time enough to take up that when we have settled the question at issue, which the Prof. has not yet *touched:* we hope he will in his next article. One topic *at a time*, Professor. We shall not consent to be drawn into more than *one at a time.* Please do us the favor to read the question for discussion, and keep to it if you intend to meet it. Let it be remembered we do not deny that there are spiritual beings, but their nature is not the subject of discussion now. It is not even what is the *nature* of "the soul," if the Prof, should reach that point; but "Has an *entity* called the *soul*" been "*superadded*" to "the *creature* man which the LORD GOD *formed* of the dust of the ground?" The Prof. "*affirms*" there has been, but has not yet brought the first item in proof of his affirmation. Did the Lord God form *man* of the dust of the ground? Yes: the Bible affirms it in unequivocal language. Did the Lord God *superadd* to that man, or any man, an entity called the soul? *No:* there is not a text in the Bible that saith so; if there was our Prof. would bring it forth: but instead of that he drives off into the *nature* of God and angels. Pray come down from your towering heights, Br. M., and give us one "Thus saith the Lord" on the affirmative of the question at issue, or own, honestly, there is none. *We know there is not one.*

"MAN'S FIRST SIN."—Such is the head of an article in "*The Congregationalist,*" Boston, Mass., of April 28th. We give some extracts from it accompanied with remarks in *notes.* The writer says:

Respecting man's origin and primal condition, we have no reliable information, except in the Bible. What this volume contains is not only our sole authority, but to every genuine believer in inspiration, it is absolute authority. (1.)

Man is a creature. He is not self-existent, but *made,* formed in part from dust. His outer being is material. What of him is material, however, constitutes but the exterior of a complex personage. Within is a spirit, the soul, without which he would be a mere brute. (2.) The account given in the Bible of man's origin, is brief, but distinct. Nothing in it is irrational or mystified. Human language does not contain more definite statements. God makes man, and man is made. (3.) . . . God stamped his own image on man. What was that image? The Scriptures do not specifically inform us; do not state in direct terms what it was; yet by implication and various hints, they doubtless reveal its nature in part, at least. God is a perfect being. He always has been so. Man was created perfect; not perfect as is God, nor as is an angel, but as a man. He was perfectly adapted to the sphere for which he was designed. God could not improve him. (4.) Among all the millions that might succeed the first man, not one could succeed him in any of the attributes of a man. This image included perfect holinesss. So the Scriptures teach. Adam and Eve were as holy when they were first created, as Jehovah himself is holy. (5.) Their natures were as free from moral stain as his. (6.) . . . Man was created a moral agent. Man's moral agency was as perfect in its sphere as God's in His. We do not believe that man was any more *compelled* to sin by the laws of his free agency than God is by the exercise of *His* free agency. Man was created to rule all the orders of beings inferior to himself, while he was to be amenable to God, and fidelity to Him was to be tested by a single interdict. The fruit of a certain tree must not be eaten. . . . The tree was selected by God as a test of obedience. Scripture gives no intimation that man could have been placed in more favorable circumstances for *standing* than he was. If he must be tried at all, he probably enjoyed as good an opportunity as he could himself desire. Nor is it to be supposed that Adam or Eve objected to the testing of their fidelity. *Probation* doubtless met their joyful approval. Laws have penalties; are useless without them. Divine interdicts must be regarded, or consequences of a penal nature will follow a disregard. *Death* was the penalty threatened. (7.) . . . On the day of their disobedience, the first sinners began to experience the penalty threatened. They died as God had declared; died before the earth had revolved again on its axis. (8.) In a moment they were dead in sin; at once they became mortal; immediately they went under the *sentence* of *eternal* death; banishment from the favor of their Father in heaven. (9.)

NOTES BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—(1.) In this sentiment we fully concur.

(2.) Where in "our sole authority" does this writer find such an account of man's creation as he has assmed in these remarks? Surely, there is none in the Book of Genesis.

(3.) Here is truth distinctly uttered. Now let him find, in these "definite statements" of man's creation, that God *added* "the soul" to the creature He formed of the dust of the ground. He "breathed into his nostrils the *breath* of life, and *man became* a living soul." Here is no addition to him of anything save the "breath of life:" that same breath by which every living creature is sustained in life as well as man.

(4.) Here is a strange mixture of truth and error. That man "was perfectly adapted to the sphere for which he was designed" is true; but to say that "God could not improve him" is going beyond "our sole authority." It is evident God has *improved* many of the race under a system of discipline.

(5.) Where do the "Scriptures teach" any such doctrine? We affirm it is nowhere to be found in

our sole authority:" let it be produced if it can be.

(6.) That is true: not however because they were *created holy*, but because no *trial* had yet developed "moral" character. Holiness is not a *creation* but a *development* in circumstances of trial, so far as created beings are concerned. Man, and every other creature which the "Lord God made, was *very good*;" so saith "our sole authority;" but to be *holy* is entirely another matter, and depends on other things, *viz:* 1st. Intelligence enough to enable the creature to understand the claims and terms of law. 2d. That he be placed under such law. 3d. Conformity to it. We can conceive of no other way for a creature to be holy.

(7.) In these last remarks we agree with the writer.

(8.) If they "died as God had *declared*, before the earth had revolved again on its axis," then they not only "*began* to experience the penalty threatened," but it was *finished* during *the same* revolving of the earth on its axis; so that there could not be any room for another and different death than what the words of threatening expressed.

(9.) Here is a group of unfounded assumptions. We do not object to some of the phraseology provided it was not evident that the writer intended to include all these assumptions under the penalty, "*Thou shalt surely die.*" To say, that was a death in sin, is without a solitary text in "the law and the testimony," by Moses or the Prophets, to sustain it. If any man sins, he is a sinner; but to call that fact the penalty of the law is to confound language. The penalty was *death* as opposed to the *life* God had given the man. Now if the writer can show, from "our sole authority," that God endowed man with spiritual life, or moral life, and with eternal life, then it will be time enough to talk of taking away *such* life. But the most unwarrantable part of the assumption is, the explanation the writer gives, that "*eternal* death" is "*banishment* from the favor of their Father in heaven;" as if "banishment" and "death" were synonymous terms. Thus the writer strives to make the impression that *death*—as employed in the threatening—in addition to a great many other things—means endless suffering: for he saith, further on in his article—"the lost sinner will *eternally suffer*;" which is another pure assumption, and the more remarkable from the fact that he says, man, after he sinned, "at once became *mortal*." If mortal—which is true—how can he eternally suffer? It will take some labor to make out such a position; yet, if man is immortal he cannot suffer: immortality is just as incapable of suffering as of death; else, immortality would cease to be immortality. Let him prove the contrary who can.

"Mr. Storrs' Book."—Under this head "*A Baptist*" pretends to review our Six Sermons, in the Michigan *Christian Herald*. The occasion of his undertaking this work is thus stated by himself at the opening of his review:—

"*Editor of the Herald*—Your readers, at least that portion of them resident in the south-west part of this State, are aware that a female preacher, teaching certain peculiar opinions, is now holding forth in that section, and with considerable success, having made many converts, a number of them from the Baptist church. The novelty of hearing a woman preach of course attracts many, and as she possesses all the volubility of her sex, and is, moreover, perfect in her lesson, she produces something of a sensation, and seems to have quite turned the heads of some of our stanch brethren, from whom we should have expected better things."

"A female preacher . . . seems to have quite turned the heads of some of our stanch brethren!" Now, is not that provoking? What! are "our stanch" Baptist "brethren" to be turned to believe that there is no immortality for man except as a gift of God, through Jesus Christ? And this done, too, by "a female preacher!" Will not "a baptist" be justified in making war upon *her* at once? Let us hear him. He says:—

"I feel inclined, my dear sir, to review the doctrine put forth by this lady, but as it might be deemed *ungallant* to attack one of the gentler sex in so new a position, and as, moreover, her peculiar tenets are based entirely on a work by Mr. G. Storrs, her sermons being frequently a mere repetition of his discourses, I shall present the reader with a review of the said work, as brief and concise as justice to the subject will permit."

So it seems our "Baptist" friend is to be very "*gallant*" in his "attack" on "Mr. Storrs' Book." Whether he means to be "*brave;* high spirited; bold; civil; or polite," in his review, we do not know; but one thing we do know, he does not possess common honesty or else is profoundly ignorant of the "book" he pretends to review. Speaking of our argument in reply to those who assert all men possess immortality because "all men *desire* immortality," he says:—

"This is admitted by our author, who admits further, that 'it is implanted in us by the Author of our being:' but thinks it a sufficient answer to say, that 'this avails nothing unless we can prove that what men desire they will possess. All men desire happiness, but does it follow, therefore, that all men *obtain happiness?* Certainly not.' Now does Mr. S. mean to deny that men *do* obtain hap-

piness? He talks of God's benevolence and love. How is it possible to prove that God is good, but by the happiness, the general, universal happiness of his creatures? Nothing could exhibit the Creator in a more unenviable light than the supposition that he gives desires to the being he has made, without the opportunity of gratification. Can Mr. S. exhibit a single instance, even among brutes, where God has given a natural desire for that which does not naturally exist? This single admission of Mr. S. is sufficient to demonstrate his whole theory false, let his proof from Scripture be what it might; for, to mention a single instance of a natural desire for that which does not naturally exist, is impossible. To assert it is to libel the Creator; to believe it is to believe a palpable absurdity. All men desire happiness, and all men attain happiness. To be sure, some men, who fancy they have no souls, possess very degraded notions of happiness, thinking it to consist in eating, drinking, and mere sensual gratification; but they reap that they have sown; they enjoy happiness, such as it is, a very low, beastly species indeed, but their desires are gratified. Yet in fact the cases are not parallel. Men desire happiness, and there is a happiness for them to attain, whether they attain it or not; but, *Men desire immortality when there is no immortality for them to attain, according to Mr. S.'s theory.*"

This last remark—which we have italicised—is an ignorant misrepresentation or a willful falsehood. He misquotes our language in the first part of this extract by substituting the words "obtain happiness" for our words "will be happy;" thus making us speak in the *present* tense when we employed the *future;* and we did so in special reference to a future state, in which the "orthodox" advocates of natural immortality maintain many "will be" unhappy, or miserable without a mixture of enjoyment. Such, we believed, could feel the force of our argument, and so would "a baptist" if he had not first perverted and *altered* our words.

Then he raises a false issue, by an inexcusable, if not a willful misstatement of our sentiments. He represents us as holding that the "Creator gives desires to the being he has made, without the opportunity of gratification." Nothing can exceed this statement in barefaced misrepresentation. In the very paragraph from which he quotes our admission of the truth, that "all men desire immortality," we say, "That desire is, without doubt, a strong principle [implanted in us by the Author of our being,] to excite us to a course of living that shall secure that invaluable blessing, which He designed to bestow upon man, if he would walk in obedience to the law of his God."

"A Baptist" quoted from this sentence, in our Six Sermons, only the words in brackets; and then proceeds to the wonderful conclusion that 'This single admission of Mr. S. is sufficient to demonstrate his whole theory false, let his proof from Scripture be what it might."

Whether our "theory" be true or "false," his representation of it *is false;* and is as palpably so as the shining of the sun in a cloudless day.

His own argument inevitably lands him in universal salvation; and perhaps this is his faith, though pretending to be "a baptist," We never uttered such a sentiment as that attributed to us in the closing lines of this extract. Nor can "a baptist" find such a sentiment in anything we ever wrote or spoke. Till he does find it, or show himself an honest man by confessing his mistake or falsehood, we shall take no further notice of him; he has debased himself too low to be admitted into a discussion with honest men; nor would we have given even this notice but from the fact a "*Christian* Herald," published by the "Baptist Convention of the State of Michigan," gave place to the falsehood in its columns. We are always happy to see reviews of our sentiments when they are conducted with Christian honesty; but if our opposers cannot refute us without resorting to "*Papal lying*," they may calculate we shall have a short conflict: they show themselves already routed.

"The Church not in Darkness, *or, The Duties of the Times.* By H. L. Hastings." This is a neat 12 mo. pamphlet of 24 pages, with covers. Price 6 cents, or $4 per 100. For sale by the author at Peacedale, R. I.; by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton st., New York; and at the *Advent Watchman* Office, 26 State st., Hartford, Conn.

It is a very interesting work, written in Br. Hastings' best and most attractive style. It may be read by all with profit.

From Dr. B. B. Schenck, Plainville, N. Y.

Br. Storrs:—I appreciate your efforts in the cause of proclaiming immortality through Christ alone. It is also my ground of hope. I understand that the Scriptures propose Christ as the *resurrection*, also. If so, and *wicked* men are raised, will they be, thereby, the children of God? The children of the resurrection, Christ says, are the children of God—or, "They are the Children of God, being the children of the resurrection." If that Spirit dwell in you which "raised up Christ from the dead, *it* shall *quicken* your mortal body." Now if that Spirit do not dwell in a man, will that untenanted body be quickened? He that hath wrought us for this self-same thing is God, who also hath given us the earnest of His Spirit. What same thing? Why, the resurrection. Why given the earnest or pledge of his Spirit? Mani-

festly to dwell in you, and finally to *quicken*. I do not read the resurrection of the *wicked*.

—

From Isaac Dimmick, Vermillionville, Ill.

Br. Storrs:— . . . The books, heretofore received from you, upon the natural immortality of the soul and other kindred doctrines, I have faithfully kept in circulation—and there is evident tokens of their usefulness. Already several have expressed their full belief in the final destruction of the wicked. I hope soon to be able to give you some cheering accounts of the progress of truth, here, in relation to this subject May God long continue to bless you, in your labors of love.

—

From Catharine Colver, Alford, Mass.

Br. Storrs:—My desire for the truth of God's word causes me to do what I can toward spreading it; therefore I cast in my mite. You know the widow's mite counted more than all the rest: so I pity you one dollar for the loss you sustained; also one dollar from a new subscriber. I wish I could do more. It is hard sailing against wind and tide; but no danger if Jesus is in the vessel. I think the prospect is more favorable to have occasionally a new comer. I find some Nicodemuses now and then: they own the truth but dare not show themselves; it is so dreadful to be called an infidel, and lose our reputation. Oh, how revolting! Why, it is equal to having the "Romans come and take away our place and nation." Oh, bless the Lord, His word stands fast forever; so that all who will come to him shall have life, and he will raise them up the last day; so there is no danger if our life is hid with Christ in God; for the name of the Lord is a strong tower into which the righteous run and are safe. We need not therefore fear if we have only the armour on, and are under the banner of Jesus; for there we may stand fast forever. Amen.

—

From Dr. J. F. Lee, Meltonsville, N. C.

My much esteemed brother, Geo. Storrs:—Will you please to accept the enclosed? Your loss invites, commands the gift. The invitation and the command, both, are quite agreeable and pleasing to the heart of a Christian. I would not be destitute of the emotions of benevolence and Christian sympathy for all the treasures of the earth. And if there is one thing that would induce me to acquire riches, it is the desire for employing them for such purposes as God requires.

I know not what a day may bring forth, but, without the interposition of mercy, it seems from the exigencies of coming events as well as those of the present moment, that there are great difficulties to encounter—great obstacles to overcome; but I most sincerely trust, that through all God will be my guide, protector, and deliverer. His grace is sufficient for me. His strength is made perfect in weakness. I cannot say what I may do this year. If I realize my expectations, I may visit the North. But should I not, you will be apt to hear from me in the course of three months.

How anxiously I wish to see you, it would be difficult to express. I have often intended to communicate many things to you, by letter; but I have as often declined from feelings, whether true or false, that led me to hope, I should have the pleasure of seeing you, when such cummuication would be more agreeable.

I sincerely wish and fervently implore that God, for his Son's sake, may aid, assist, and preserve you; that you may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Grace be with you. Amen.

—

From John C. Kennon, Hanover, Conn.

Dear Brother:—I have, through a lover of truth, had the opportunity of examining a few numbers of the BIBLE EXAMINER, and have become interested in the truth, Those have opened my eyes to a new light, as one who knows that sanctification is attained through the truth. I feel as though your labor of love, through your paper, is the means of causing the true light to arise, and I will be gratified if you will send it me. I feel that the truth will prevail amidst whatever opposition. I do not fear for you at all. It is my constant payer that not only you, but all, may know the truth and walk in it. Yours in love, and in hope of immortality through Jesus Christ.

—

From H. H. Nottingham, Franciscoville, Mich.

Br. Storrs:—Though unacquainted with you, yet as you appear to be public property, I thought I would address you as one of like precious faith; for, I must acknowledge that through the instrumentality of your writings, and others, I learned that I had no immortality out of Christ—that eternal happiness was not the grand object of of Christ's mission into the world; but as the Scriptures declare, he came that we might have life, and that more abundantly. Oh, that each one, that professes to believe the gospel of Christ, would purify themselves by that form of doctrine given them in the scriptures; for they are able to make us wise unto salvation, as the Apostle declares. I might give scope to my thoughts, yet I feel that I have not the ability to give light, but my heart is in the work. Be assured, my dear brother, of my kindest regard; praying that you yet may be the instrument, in the hands of our heavenly Father, of converting many souls (persons) from heathenish philosophy, and the traditions and commandments of men. Now that the God of all grace may keep us unto eternal life at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the prayer of your Brother, in hope of eternal life at the resurrection of the Just.

—

SHEOL.—This word most commonly signifies the grave, or the place or state of the dead. Jacob says, Gen. 37: 35, "I will go down into the grave," or into hell, "to my son mourning." *I will die with grief, I will never leave mourning till I die.* So in Gen. 42: 38, "If mischief befall Benjamin, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave," or to hell. *You will make me, who am worn away already, to die with grief.* The conspirators Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, were swallowed up in the earth, and descended quick into hell, or the grave; *they were buried alive*, Num. 16: 30, 31.—*Cruden's Concordance, word Hell.*

REMOVAL.—Circumstances, over which we had no control, have made it necessary for us to *remove* to 140 Fulton street (second floor), in R. T. Young's Book Store, where our friends will find us, usually, from 8 o'clock A. M. till 5 P. M.

We will simply say—The circumstances referred to have placed us under financial embarrassment which it is impossible for us to meet unless our friends will increase the number of our paying subscribers. We can supply four or five hundred more with the EXAMINER from the commencement of the year; and if that number were immediately added to our list it would give us the aid we need. We have on hand about one hundred *sets* of the EXAMINER for 1853 (last year.) We will give *one set* of that to any person who will send us $2 for two new subscribers for this year, till they are exhausted. Or, if they prefer a set of '49, '50, '51, or '52, they shall have it till they are exhausted. Of the last-named years we have but a few sets left.

Once more:—For $5 we will send *seven* copies of the EXAMINER for *this* year to any names given us; or, for $10 *fifteen*.

These offers are made in view of our necessities, and are not to be considered a precedent to any future subscriptions.

All money sent for the EXAMINER is at *our risk*; and no one who owes for the paper should wait for an agent to call for their money, but send it *direct* to us. Address "GEO. STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office*, New York."

EDITOR'S RESPONSIBILITY.—Some seem to suppose that we endorse all the sentiments contained in articles we publish; especially if they are *selected*. We do not so regard it. It often happens that sentiments are contained in excellent articles that, to us, are unsound; but the general character is such that we esteem them valuable, and deem it best to let the defects pass unnoticed, trusting the good sense of our readers to make the discrimination. To sit watching to make notes on every thought that differs from our own, in a selected or original article, it seems to us, is to suspect our readers of an incapacity to discriminate truth from error.

We do not, therefore, regard ourself as endorsing anything in the columns of the EXAMINER unless we expressly so state it: our silence is not to be construed into an endorsement. We often see remarks in articles we publish from the writings of others that we do not approve, but think best to let them pass without note or comment, as that generally provokes a reply, and perhaps leads to a fruitless controversy.

IRREGULAR ISSUES.—It has become utterly impossible to issue the EXAMINER regularly on the *first* and *fifteenth* of each month. We can set it up in time, but having no Press that we can control, we are obliged to wait till we can find one vacant, which sometimes keeps our form standing several days after it is ready for the Press. We have no means of remedying this evil; and our patrons will bear with the delays that will sometimes occur in consequence of it. Every Press in New York seems to be crowded night and day with work; we will endeavor, however, to send out our paper as regularly as possible.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c.—We keep the following works constantly on hand, viz.: *Bible vs. Tradition*, 75 cts.:—*Dobney Abridged*, or "Part Second" of Dobney on Future Punishment, 25 cts.:—*Unity of Man*, being a Reply to Luther Lee, by Anthropos, 15 cts.:—*Six Sermons*, 18 mo., 15 cts.:—*Moncrieff's Dialogues* on Future Punishment, 10 cents.

The following works can only be supplied for a short time:—*Storrs' Miscellany*; a few copies only left; 50 cts: No more will be printed. A few copies of *The Generations, Gathered and Gathering*; and also *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, 10 cts. each. Very few left, and there will not be another issue of them in this cheap form, if at all. A few hundreds of the *Bible Examiner Extra*—or the Six Sermons in the quarto form—are still left, 5 cents single copy; 25 copies for $1. Bible Examiner for 1852 and '53, bound in one volume, $1,50.

We have just issued three new *Tracts* of four octavo pages each, written by Br. Nicholas Dabb, late a Minister in the Methodist E. Church. Nothing better than these has been issued, as tracts, to gain attention to the immortality question, and to show the folly of the common sentiments on the subject. They are entitled

AN APPEAL TO MEN OF REASON AND COMMON SENSE:

THE CONRAST: OR MAN'S WORD VS. GOD'S WORD:

IS THIS INFIDELITY?

PRICE—Sixty cents per 100 copies: $5 per 1000.

DONATIONS since June 1st.—Jas. Battersby $1; J. W. Snyder, $2; Dr. J. F. Lee, $4; Peter Davey, $1,50.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JULY 1, 1854. NO. 13.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT:

Or, the Hebrew Terms "Ruach" and "Neshamah," and the Greek Term "Pneuma."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

Ruach—*First Hebrew Term.*

Section I. Ruach, is a noun, of which the verb is *ruach*, meaning to breathe, to blow.

Sec. II. Ruach is rendered *wind, blast, air, tempest, whirlwind.* We will present a few examples.

1, *Wind*—Gen. 3 : 8, "They heard the voice of the Lord walking in the cool (margin, wind, Heb, ruach,) of the day; i. e. in the morning when the cool breeze springs up. Ex. 15 : 10, "Thou didst blow with thy wind" (ruchaka). Job 1 : 19, "a wind (ruach) from the wilderness." Wherever the single term wind occurs in the Old Testament, it is *ruach* in the Hebrew.

2, *Blast*—Exod. 15 : 8, "And with the blast (ruach) of thy nostrils," &c. 2, Kings 19 : 7, "I will send a blast (ruach) upon him."

3, *Air*—Job 41 : 16, "no air (ruach) can come between them."

4, *Tempest*—Ps. 11 : 6, "upon the wicked he shall rain an horrible tempest (ruach).

5, *Whirlwind*—Ezek. 1 : 4, "a whirlwind (ruach) came out of the north," &c.

Sec. III. Ruach is rendered *side and quarter.*

1, *Side*—Jer. 52 : 23, "there were ninety and six pomegranates on a side" (ruchah), literally *on a wind;* i. e. looking towards the quarters whence the winds came. So also, Ezek. 42 : 16, "He measured the east side" (ruach, margin, wind). v. 17, "the north side" (ruach). v. 18, "the south side" (ruach). v. 19, "the west side" (ruach). v. 20, "by the four sides" (ruchoth), &c.

2, *Quarter*—1 Chron. 9 : 24, "In four quarters (ruchoth, literally winds) were the porters toward the east, west," &c.

The positions occupied by the porters are called winds, (ruchoth) because the four winds blew toward those points; or they looked back toward the quarter whence the four winds came.

Sec. IV. Ruach is rendered *breath.*

Gen. 6 : 17, "All flesh wherein is the breath (ruach) of life,"—meaning every animal that lives by breathing. 7 : 15, "And they went in unto Noah into the ark two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life." In v. 23 of the same chap. we read "every living substance (or being) was destroyed which was upon the face of the earth, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; they were destroyed from the earth; and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark." Does not the sense in which 'the cattle,' 'the creeping things,' and 'the fowl of heaven,' were destroyed 'from the earth,' tell us the sense in which man was destroyed also? If the men lived anywhere in the universe after their destruction by the flood, why not believe the same of the other creatures that were drowned in the waters? Nothing can be more explicit than the affirmation "every living substance (or being) was destroyed;" and if the *ruach* (the word frequently rendered "spirit," as we shall soon see) of man is a living substance, then it perished literally in the deluge, like the *ruach* in the other creatures overwhelmed in the flood. All in whom was the *ruach* of life were to die; v. 17. Compare Ec. 3 : 19.

Job 9 : 18, "He will not suffer me to take my breath" (ruchi). 12 : 10, "In whose hand is the breath (ruach) of all mankind." See Gen. 7 : 15, above, in this section. 19 : 17, "My breath (ruchi) is corrupt." Ps. 33 : 6, "The breath (ruach) of his mouth." 104 : 29, "Thou takest away their breath (ruacham) THEY DIE, and return to their dust. 135 : 17, "Neither is there any breath (ruach) in their mouths," i. e., they are lifeless. 146 : 4, "His (man's) breath (ruchu) goeth forth, HE returneth to his earth, in that *very day* HIS THOUGHTS PERISH."

It was the organized being that thought, not his *ruach.* The breath merely animated the organization, and thought, one of the products of that organization, like all other physical and mental functions and phenomena, perished in that very day when the man ceased to breathe.

Eccles. 3 : 19, "They (men and animals) have all one breath" (ruach). They breathe common, life-imparting air. Isa. 11 : 14, "With the breath (ruach) of his lips shall he slay the wicked." He shall speak them into ruin. 30 : 28, "his breath" (ruchu). Jer. 10 : 14, "his molten image is falsehood, and there is no breath (ruach) in them." Jer. 51 : 17. In other words, the molten image is lifeless and helpless. Lam. 3 : 56, "hide not thine ear at my breathing" (ravchathi,—Feminine form of ruach). In Exodus 8 : 15, the same word is rendered "respite." "When Pharaoh saw that

there was respite," or breathing time, "he hardened his heart," &c. Ezek. 37 : 5, "Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, behold I will cause breath (ruach) to enter into, and YE SHALL LIVE." Verse 8, "the skin covered them above, but there was no breath (ruach) in them." They were perfect men now, though unalive; as perfect as a watch is before its moving operations begin. Verse 9, "Thus saith the Lord God, come from the four winds (ruchoth) O breath (ruach), and breathe upon the slain, THAT THEY MAY LIVE." Up to this period they were lifeless, like Adam before God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," (Gen. 2 : 7,) i. e., inflated his lungs with the vitalizing atmosphere. Verse 10, "So I prophesied, as he commanded me, and the breath (ruach) came into them and THEY LIVED." "They lived;" so Adam became alive and conscious as soon as the Creator made him inhale the life-kindling atmosphere. Gen. 2 : 7. Hab. 2 : 19, "Woe unto him that saith to the wood, awake, and to the dumb stone, arise, it shall teach! Behold it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath (ruach) at all in the midst of it." "No breath in the midst of it" is equivalent to this—the idol is lifeless.

Here we may introduce a few passages where, though the word used to translate *ruach* is "spirit," the meaning, in our view, is simply "breath," i. e., "breath of life."

Ecc. 3 : 21, "Who knoweth the spirit (ruach) of man that goeth upward (margin, "*is ascending*"), and the spirit (ruach) of the beast that goeth downward to the earth."

a. Let the reader observe that, in verse 19 of this chapter, the same Hebrew word, *ruach*, is rendered "breath," "they"—men and animals—"have all one breath" (ruach); and why the English word "breath was used in translating the 19th verse, and "spirit" the 21st verse, is not easily accounted for, unless, perhaps, we bear in mind the creed of the translators about human spirits. The Hebrew term in both verses is the same, and there is not in the 21st verse, or in the context, anything that can warrant the supposition that it is not the same *ruach* which is spoken of in both. As far as we can determine, the meaning of verse 21 is this—Who knoweth the breath of man that, in consequence of his erect position, goeth upward from his nostrils; and the breath of the cattle that, in consequence of the drooping position of their heads, is expired toward the earth? Who knoweth it? Who apprehends its wonderful life-sustaining powers? Who can explain why mere breathing should cause and preserve animation and all its astonishing phenomena?

b. Observe, there is nothing about death in the passage; the ascending of the one *ruach* and the descending of the other *ruach* is something that occurs during life, and is within the observation of any person.

c. Observe, also, there is nothing about an immaterial and immortal human spirit here, as there is no where else in the sacred volume.

d. This *ruach* or "spirit," called in Gen. 6 : 17, "the breath (ruach) of life," and in Job 33 : 4, "the breath (ruach) of the Almighty,"—this *ruach*, which, unfortunately for truth and piety, has been so magnified and mystified, turns out to be nothing more than just oxygenated, electrified atmosphere,—the air which, when inhaled, keeps men and the crowds of other breathing creatures alive. "They have all one breath," (ruach) v. 19. We confess this is a very humble sense compared with the popular one, but candid, God-fearing minds neither seek for lofty meanings nor lowly ones; it is the true meaning they want in every case.

e. It may be stated that another exposition of the verse has been proposed, and, that the reader may be enabled to make his choice, we shall present the one referred to, in an extract from that excellent work, "The Generations Gathered and Gathering," by Mr. Ham, of Bristol. "Instead of reading," says the author, "Who knoweth the spirit of a man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth?" Luther gives the correct reading as follows, "Who knoweth *whether* the spirit of man goeth upward," &c. This rendering is supported by the Septuagint and Vulgate, and instead of disagreeing with the former statements of the preacher,—as our English version,—is in perfect consistency with them. Thus, the meaning of this interrogatory is, "Who knoweth of any difference in the destinies of man and the beast?" There is no difference in respect to their *destinies*, although there is in respect to their natures. Their destiny is identical, —"ALL GO UNTO ONE PLACE"—so that a man hath NO PRE-EMINENCE above a beast."—p. 105.

Instead of wishing to point out a vast difference between the human beings and the inferior animals, founded on the *ruach* of each, the author of Ecclesiastes shows their perfect resemblance in that very respect; they have all ONE *ruach*—one breath, or spirit of life; they all live in the same manner, i. e. by breathing *ruach* or vital air. Read this entire passage about the resemblance in constitution and manner of life between man and the cattle, and we think you will be amazed at the extravagant elevation to which dust-formed men (Gen. 2 : 7,) in virtue of having *ruach*, have been ignorantly and superstitiously raised;—a *ruach*, be it carefully noted, common after all, to him with the beasts of the field, yea with the very humblest breathing animal on earth! "I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts (or are like the cattle.) For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath *no pre-eminence* above a beast; for all is vanity. ALL GO (at death) UNTO ONE place; ALL ARE OF THE DUST, AND ALL TURN TO DUST AGAIN," &c.

Another verse is Eccles. 12 : 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (ruach) shall return to God who gave it."

a. The "spirit" here is just the *ruach*, "breath," or "breath of life," common to man with the other breathing animals inhabiting the globe along with him. When it departs in the hour of dissolution then all is over; the man is for the time as if he

had never been. Job 10 : 19. Hence, and no wonder at it, the writer adds in verse 8, "vanity of vanities, all is vanity!" How could we account for such an exclamation, had we any reason to believe that Solomon understood the *ruach* of man to be actually an immortal living substance—the actual immortal man himself,—departing into the awful presence of the Eternal Judge? In the sense in which he used the word *ruach*, as being the breath of life departing from man, who was now to go down to the dust, the exclamation is easily understood. Thus the 7th verse, "Then shall the dust," &c., harmonizes completely with the account of man's creation, "The Lord God formed MAN of the DUST of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the BREATH OF LIFE, and man became a living soul," person or being. Gen. 2 : 7. At the hour of death this life-giving breath returns to its Divine Owner; that, however, is no less true in regard to the breath of life possessed by all creatures on earth, whenever their last moment has arrived. Man's breath goes back to the Creator, in other words, it returns to the immense ocean of *ruach* surrounding our planet, belonging, like all things else, to the Almighty, and he gives it to other beings who he is daily summoning into existence, who, after using it, in their course restore it when they die to the charge of the great Proprietor. "If he sets his heart upon man, if he gather to himself HIS SPIRIT, and HIS BREATH, all flesh shall perish, and *man* shall return to the dust." Job 34 : 14 15. When God has recalled his life-giving breath from man, then the being man is numbered with the dead: *it* was not the man, since it merely made him alive. Forthwith he is in that condition in which, of necessity, he knows "not anything," his "love," his "hatred," and his "envy," are now "perished." Eccles. 9 : 5, 6.

b. In confirmation of the doctrine just penned, that man descends to the dust, instead of departing at death to live in consciousness somewhere else in the universe, let the reader note it well, the author of Ecclesiastes affirms that at death both men and cattle go "UNTO ONE PLACE," chap. 3 : 20. This is different from the teaching now popular in the world! "All go unto *one* place; all are of the dust; and all turn to dust again."

In connection with this text let us suppose one to say, man has an animal *ruach*, or a spirit that gives him animal life, similar to that of all breathing creatures; but he may also have a rational and immortal *ruach*, which, of course, will survive death, according to the prevailing opinion. To this we would reply,

1st. Were that the fact, then, as this rational spirit is truly the man, the body being merely the case which for a time fetters and imprisons it, or the organic medium through which are given its manifestations in the present term of existence;—we say were this the fact, it would not be true, as the Book affirms that *men die*; and that the dead know not anything, and that at the final hour of a human being his very thoughts perish. Are we not assured, for example, that in the flood "every living substance" perished? How could the men perish,—and they perished just as the fowl and creeping things—if immediately afterward, they were actually alive, and on to this hour have been exercising all the functions, and acquainted with the whole circle of experiences, belonging to conscious existence? In that case the flood set men free from bondage; it did not destroy them. Shall we hold by a conjecture—a fancy,—or the plain assertion of Holy Writ?

2nd. Again, if man has an animal *ruach* and a rational and deathless one, why do we never hear of the spirits of each member of our race? or why is there never some adjective prefixed to the word *ruach*, so as to lead us to draw the great distinction, and to know when the one is spoken of and when the other? Is it unreasonable to expect this? Is it conceivable that, had man possessed *two* spirits with such a vast difference betwixt them, the one living, the other life giving,—the one fleeting, the other immortal as God himself,—that we should not have had it distinctly pointed out, and that again and again in the Bible? On the subject the Record is as silent as the grave itself. "ALL FLESH is as grass, and all THE GLORY of man as the flower of grass." 1 Pet. 1 : 24. The very glory, and *all* the glory of man is like grass!

Another passage is Eccles. 8 : 8, "There is no man that hath power over the spirit (ruach) to retain the spirit (ruach); neither hath he power in the day of death; and there is no discharge in that war; neither shall wickedness deliver those that are given to it."

a. We cannot do better than quote the annotation of Dr. Clarke on this verse, which is far from being a plain passage. "The Chaldee," he says, has, 'there is no man who can rule over the spirit of the breath, so as to prevent the animal life from leaving the body.' Others translate to this sense, 'No man hath power over the *wind* to restrain the wind, and no one hath power over death to restrain him; and when a man engages as a *soldier*, he cannot be discharged from the war till it is ended, and by wickedness no man shall be delivered from any evil.' Taking it in this way, these," continues Dr. C. "are maxims which contain self-evident truths. Others suppose the verse to refer to the King who tyrannizes over and oppresses his people. He shall also account to God for his actions; he shall die and he cannot prevent it; and when he is judged his wickedness cannot deliver him."

b. The exposition, mentioned by Dr. C., of *ruach*, which supposes it to import *wind*, seems to give the passage a natural and striking sense; but if *ruach* here refers to the "spirit" of man, the meaning is no less plain. Solomon is the best expositor of his own language, and when we read in the verses already explained, for instance chap. 3 : 19, "They (men and animals) have all ONE breath" (ruach) of life, or spirit of life, we must understand him as referring to the same thing in passages that seem to be substantially parallel. Had he spoken of the immortal, the ever-living, the unquenchable spirit of man, the popular teaching about the human spirit would have had good support; but he obviously entertained no such opinion, and what inspired penman uses the language, or the most

distant approach to it? Among the sacred writers, says Lowth, in his Lectures on Hebrew Poetry, p. 78, "We find—no explicit mention of immortal spirits,"—and if they make none, why should we?

At this stage of our progress it seems proper to make a brief reference to a passage in Genesis which has been variously understood by parties whose judgment cannot but be respected; on which, in consequence of the diversity of opinion regarding its meaning, we would not, however, lay any stress, though we cannot rafrain from stating some facts in connection with it. The verse is Gen. 6 : 3, "And the Lord said, my spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh, yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years."

a. It is clear that our translators understood by the "Spirit" in this text Jehovah's Holy, or the Divine Spirit, who was henceforth only to strive with the antediluvians for an hundred and twenty years, with a view to their conversion and restoration to piety and virtue. When so understood a parallel is found to it in the words of Stephen, Acts 7 : 51, "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did so do ye." Whether this is the correct sense in the passage or not, we have every reason to believe it is a truth. Then, as still, God's Holy Spirit was striving with sinful men, and the mercies given to the rebels in the days of Noah, and the warnings and calls to repentance addressed to their hearts, by that preacher of righteousness, were some of the modes in which the Spirit of God attempted to overcome their impiety.

b. The other exposition we shall mention refers the "Spirit." not to the Divine Spirit, but to the spirit of, or from God, which gives life to men; or the spirit or breath of God which is in man's nostrils. Parallels are found to this idea in Job 27 : 3, "all the while my breath is in me and the spirit (ruach) of God is in my nostrils;" and 34 : 14, 15, "If he (God) set his heart upon man, if he gather to himself his spirit (ruach—the spirit God gave him) and his breath (the breath God gave him) all flesh shall PERISH together, and MAN shall turn again unto dust." Viewing the passage thus, there is more meaning visible in the reason "*for* he also is flesh:" what bearing the reason in this clause can have on the foregoing statement, understanding it to refer to the Divine Spirit, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man," we cannot discover with any measure of satisfaction. This appears to be the meaning of the text; my spirit, that is, my life-giving spirit shall not always dwell with, or in, man, because he also is flesh, and therefore mortal; yet, or nevertheless, his days shall be continued for an hundred and twenty years.

c. Gesenius renders the clause, "my spirit shall not be made low in man forever." He says also most of the ancient versions give to the verb rendered "strive" in our Bible the sense of "remaining and dwelling." The Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament used in the days of our Lord and his Apostles, rendered the Hebrew verb in question by *katameine*, which signifies to remain. In the Syriac and Arabic the same sense is given. The Vulgate has "*non permanebit*," shall not remain. And this, says Gesenius, is best adapted to the context.

[To be Continued.]

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Affirmative by C. F. Hudson.

Dear Br. Storrs—Before proceeding with the argument, I find the question must be divested of certain appendages that are connecting themselves with it. Br. Grew asks, "Is it possible that our intelligent brother can suppose that such a declaration, (Gen. 2 : 7) is an adequate basis for the popular theory of a distinct, independent, indestructible entity?" Such allusion to the "popular theory" can only create false issues. Popular theories may be debated with those who hold them; this discussion is better confined to the question in hand. Why does Br. G. use the word "indestructible?" I hold with many others that the death of the body does not destroy the soul; but so far from having said that the soul is therefore indestructible, I hold that *for that very reason* it is destructible in a specially proper sense. Precisely *because* it is a distinct entity, it may be destroyed just when, and as, divine justice shall require. And hence the distinction made, and the warning given, in Mat. 10 : 28, on which passage I shall say more hereafter. Whereas, if soul is an attribute of matter, or an endowment of the body, the question of its destructibility is at once perplexed.

Again, the question between us is not whether the words *nephesh* and *psuche* might not often be translated or replaced by such terms as *life, breath, blood, man, person, self*, &c. It is doubtless so. But no philologist would infer that *nephesh* and *psuche* may not also mean 'soul,' and that soul be a distinct entity. Usage gives words their import, and not etimology. Few indeed are the words of any language, even of the sacred languages, which have not burst the bonds of their primary and physical meanings.

Nor are we disputing whether the soul is *naturally* mortal or immortal. Dodwell held that all souls are *naturally mortal*, but yet will be *actually immortal*. I on the one hand, query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*, though I am sure the smaller number of human souls may be *actually* immortal. What is the *law of nature* in the case we may never know, because we cannot tell what, or how much, is *law*, and what, or how much, is *miracle* or an overruling of law, in the divine economy. The question in hand would not have suffered so sadly, if men had talked more modestly about the laws of nature; and this view I am happy to find stated by Whately, in his "Peculiarities of the Christian Religion," Essay 1. You see at once that such words as "naturally" or "by nature" will not help this discussion either way.

Nor are we debating whether the soul can *act* independently of the body, or of some body.—Nor, whether the soul is asleep or awake, conscious

tameine, which signifies to
ac and Arabic the same
ulgate has "*non permane-*
And this, says Gesenius,
context.

Continued.]

DISTINCT ENTITY?

by C. F. Hudson.

efore proceeding with the
estion must be divested of
t are connecting themselves
s, "Is it possible that our
uppose that such a declara-
adequate basis for the po-
ct, independent, indestruc-
allusion to the "popular
ate false issues. Popular
ted with those who hold
better confined to the ques-
loes Br. G. use the word
old with many others that
does not destroy the soul;
said that the soul is there-
old that *for that very reason*
pecially proper sense. Pre-
stinct entity, it may be des-
as, divine justice shall re-
distinction made, and the
10 : 28, on which passage
ter. Whereas, if soul is an
an endowment of the body,
tructibility is at once per-

etween us is not whether the
e might not often be translat-
terms as *life, breath, blood,*
It is doubtless so. But no
r that *nephesh* and *psuche*
ul,' and that soul be a dis-
gives words their import,
ew indeed are the words of
the sacred languages, which
onds of their primary and

g whether the soul is *natu-*
al. Dodwell held that all
tal, but yet will be *actually*
ne hand, query whether the
nmortal, though I am sure
human souls may be *actual-*
s the *law of nature* in the
ow, because we cannot tell
is *law*, and what, or how
a overruling of law, in the
question in hand would not
y, if men had talked more
vs of nature; and this view
stated by Whately, in his
Christian Religion," Essay 1.
such words as "naturally"
not help this discussion eith-

ng whether the soul can *act*
body, or of some body.—
is asleep or awake, conscious

or unconscious, in the intermediate state. But, does the soul *exist* when the earthly body has decayed, and ere the spiritual body is assumed? I hold that it *does* then exist, not only *potentially* and *virtually* in the power and purpose of God, (for in such a sense it existed before the world was,) but *properly* and *actually*, so that the resurrection shall not be an absolutely new creation. And it is because my good friends seem to dissent from this opinion, that I offer my views.

And I regard this question as important because the question of personal identity and of a proper final judgment seems to me involved. And in giving the *history* of this discussion, I may show that the names of Democritus, Epicurus, Hobbes, Helvetius and Diderot, and the Epicurean philosophy of our own day, have much to do with it. Thus, by the oft noted inconsistency of human reasonings, Christians may hold opinions which give infidels serious advantage. And therefore it behoves Christians when they advance opinions respecting the nature of things, to be considerate how they appeal to a 'Thus saith the Lord,' lest perchance they have misinterpreted both nature and revelation, and the sacred Word which they offer be rejected.

Again, I should say just here, the idea that the soul may survive the body without being immortal, may be thought strange now-a-days; but I may show before I close, that it has been, both among the wise and the simple, one of the commonest of human beliefs.

In my last, I endeavored to show that a certain argument proved too much; viz.—that the incarnate Savior must have been Spirit and only such. Bro. G. replies by stating several *facts* which I have no occasion to deny; since, I think, they do not effect the *reasoning* by which I endeavored to refute the argument then in hand.

We are now, I trust, prepared for the Bible argument. And I wish first to examine those passages which I think indicate the independent existence of the soul, and afterwards those which may seem to indicate the contrary. It may be well to offer here a list of such texts, on either side, as are likely to decide the question.

I. Gen. 2 : 7; 37 : 35; 1 Sam. 28 : 12; Ps. 16 : 10; Eccl. 12 : 7; Isa. 10 : 18; Dan. 12 : 2; Mat. 10 : 28; 17 : 4; 22 : 32; Luke 16 : 22; Acts 7 : 59; 1 Cor. 15 : 18; 2 Cor. 5 : 4; 12 : 2; 1 Thes. 5 : 23; Heb. 12 : 23; 1 Pet. 3 : 19; Rev. 6 : 9.

II. Gen. 3 : 19; Job 10 : 19—22; Ps. 6 : 5; 30 : 3, 9; 88 : 11, 12; 146 : 4; Eccl. 9 : 4; Isa. 26 : 19; 38 : 18; 53 : 12; 1 Cor. 15 : 18, 36, 44, 47.

To forestall prejudice against any argument from the first class of passages, I should say that I am not responsible for popular inferences from any of them. I might also add to the second class, but that is Bro. G.'s right rather than mine. One text, (1 Cor. 15 : 18,) I have named in each list, because it is claimed on each side.

Upon Gen. 2 : 7, I shall say more when I come to the question whether the bodily organism produces the soul, or the soul in-forms and energizes the body.

In Gen. 37 : 35, Jacob says, "I will go down into the grave, to my son, mourning." Joseph, he supposed, had been devoured by evil beasts.—They were his sepulchre, if "grave" means sepulchre. But the tomb, or the place or state of burial, was not what Jacob had in mind. The Hebrew word here translated "grave" is not *keber* but *sheol*. And it was in *sheol* or *hades* that he expected to be gathered unto his son. But how could this be, if his son was out of existence? And he was utterly, if not for ever, destroyed, soul and body, if his being was dependent on his bodily organism; and Jacob's resolve must have contemplated simply a sharing of Joseph's annihilation. But did he not conceive of Joseph as still, somehow, existing?

The *locality* of *Sheol* is no part of the present argument, only it is proper to remark that neither *sheol* nor *hades* can be properly translated "grave," in any passage of the Bible. The condition of the dead in *hades* may be never so destitute, of thought or motion. But upon their distinct existence depends all the propriety of Jacob's language, and, as I think, all our hope of a proper resurrection.

The passage in 1 Sam. 28 : 12, is I know much disputed. But two or three circumstances indicate that it is to be understood as it reads. The terror of the witch of Endor seems real and not feigned. The prophecy uttered was a true one. And even if we yield to those interpreters who suppose it was only a *phantasma Samuelis* that appeared, the language of verse 19 indicates that Samuel was still in existence. "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me." We can hardly suppose that God would allow a phantom to speak true of Saul's fate, and to speak false of the intermediate state. The whole passage needs an abler solution than I know of, to disprove the survivance of the soul.

Ps. 16 : 10, is a prophecy of Christ's resurrection. Because he was to rise again, his soul should not be left in Hades, and because he should speedily rise, his body suffered no decay. But was his body in Hades? If not, his soul was in a separate state. And so may be the souls of all his followers, to whom, through death but not extinction, he has "shown the path of life."

On Eccl. 12 : 7, I am much pleased with a remark of Courtenay in his work on "The Future States." His view of the intermediate state differs somewhat from mine; but as I cannot think he pantheizes, or means that the soul is an emanation from God, and re-absorbed, at death, into the divine essence, I offer his language with little comment. He says:

"When therefore it is said, that on the return of the body to the dust, 'the spirit returns to God who gave it,' we ought not to imagine, as some do, an ascent of the spirit towards the skies; but simply an assertion of the fact, that the spirit, which when given by the Creator, and detached, as it were, from Him, constituted a living creature, has now reverted back to Him who gave it, and become, not by change of *place* but of *ownership*, His property again." p. 279.

If the spirit is owned by Him from whom it

came, without having become a part of Him, it must have a separate existence.

The remaining passages must be reserved for another letter. Yours in the love of Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Bro. Storrs—Not learning from Bro. Hudson's former article, how far he accords with the popular theory, in advocating the disinct entity of the soul; I proposed the question he has quoted. As that theory implies the immortality of every human soul, either by nature or divine decree, it implies its indistructibility in respect to fact. We accord with him that no "false issues" shall be created, and that "this discussion is better confined to the question in hand." We hold our friend "responsible" only for what he avows to be his own sentiments.

That our discussion may be conducted intelligently and profitably, in christian love, for the truth's sake; we desire our brother to give us, as fully as he can, the ideas he attaches to his proposition of the soul being a distinct entity from the body or the material organism. "Usage" does *not* always "give words their (true scriptural) import." He remarks, "I hold with many others that the death of the body does not destroy the soul—I hold *for that very reason* it is destructible in a special proper sense. Precisely because it is a distinct entity, it may be destroyed," &c. "I on the one hand, query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*," &c.

I ask our friend, if it is naturally *immortal*, is it not naturally *indestructible?*

"Nor are we debating" (Br. H. observes) "whether the soul can *act* independently of the body, or of some body.—Nor, whether the soul is asleep or awake, conscious or unconscious, in the intermediate state: But does the soul *exist* when the earthly body has decayed, and ere the spiritual body is assumed? I hold that it *does* exist—properly and actually," &c.

I ask if the *proper* and *actual* existence of the soul, as a distinct entity from the body, does not *necessarily* involve its consciousness? If we prove that no part of man has consciousness in the intermediate state, do we not prove that man possesses no such distinct entity from his material organism, as Br. H. supposes? Is that a distinct entity worthy of any man's advocacy, which has no knowledge, or thought, or affection? However, if Br. H. can prove, from the bible, that man possesses a distinct entity from his body which can exist in this dormant state, or in any other, far be it from us to deny it.

We gratefully accept the caution "to be considerate how (we) appeal to a 'Thus saith the Lord,'" but we must assure our friend, that we cannot reject any thing the Lord hath spoken to us, although the whole catalogue of Infidels and Satan himself should subscribe to it. See Math. 8: 29. We admit that "the soul may survive the body without being immortal." The question is, does man *possess* such "a distinct entity," or soul, as Br. H. imagines?

I proceed to review our friend's remarks on "the Bible argument."

"Gen. 37: 35, Jacob says, 'I will go down into the grave, to my son mourning.' Br. H. asks, 'did he not conceive of Joseph as still, somehow, existing?'" I reply, that the words imply no other conception than that of a dead man. Not the shadow of proof is here, that Jacob supposed any "entity," "distinct" from the dead body, existed, either conscious or unconscious. The word is *sheol*, but what does the patriarch say about any "*distinct entity*" of his son being there? Not a word. "It was in *sheol* or *hades*," Br. H. remarks, "that he expected to be gathered unto his son. But how could this be, if his son was out of existence?" I answer, if Jacob's idea of *sheol* was a scriptural one (which we have no right to question), he could have no other expectation of being "gathered unto his son" in *sheol* than of being gathered to him in a state where "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom," Eccles. 9: 10. Against *such* a "distinct existence" we do not argue. The existence of an entity, distinct from the body, is a very different matter, and remains to be proved.

As Br. H. thinks it is proper to remark that neither *sheol* or *hades* can be properly translated 'grave' in any passage in the bible; I think it proper to remark, that Mr. G. Campbell, in his Dissertations, observes, contrary to his own opinion, that "it appears at present to be the prevailing opinion among critics, that the term, at least in the Old Testament, means no more than *Keber, grave* or *sepulchre*." After all his own ingenious reasonings, he approximates to the scriptural definition of *sheol*, Eccles. 9: 10, by remarking, "Thus much in general seems always to have been presumed concerning it; that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad." "I freely acknowledge that, by translating *sheol*, the *grave*, the purport of the sentence is often expressed with sufficient clearness." For an example, he adduces the passage, "Ye will bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave." (*Sheol.*)

This, he affirms, "undoubtedly gives the meaning of the sentence in the original," &c. I understand this to be the import of the term in Gen. 37 : 35, as our translators have given it. Be this, however, as it may, the clear representrtion of the Bible is, that whatever the precise meaning of the term (*sheol*) may be, that it is the place or state of *dead men*, where there is "no work, or device, or knowledge, or wisdom," and not any place or state of any *distinct entity* from the material man, which is the matter assumed by our friend and pertains to him to prove.

1 Sam. 28 : 12 is referred to. Our friend remarks—"The whole passage needs an abler solution than I know of, to disprove the survivance of the soul." I do not know that any writer has referred to it for this purpose. We have no need of it. We have plain positive divine declarations, which we have given, and which remain for Bro. H. to answer. But as our brother has adduced it, in proof of "the survivance of the soul," as a distinct entity, we will examine his comments. He claims that "it is to be understood as it reads." Let him then be consistent. How does it read? Does the woman propose to bring any disembodied spirit *down from heaven* or from *any place* of the survivance of such "a distinct entity?" Neither the king nor the woman propose any such thing. "Bring me *up* whom I shall name unto thee."—"Whom shall I bring up?" is the language. What brought she up? "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." Now "if it is to be understood as it reads," it must be understood that the veritable bodily man, Samuel, was raised from the dead and came up out of sheol, where "there is neither knowledge or device," &c., clothed with a *mantle!* The representation, to answer our friend's purpose, should have been a conference with a disembodied spirit, somewhat like the pretensions of the "seducing spirits" of our own times. As it is, it is entirely adverse to his purpose. He writes, "suppose it was only a *phantasma Samuelis* that appeared, the language of verse 19 indicates that Samuel was still in existence." I affirm that it indicates nothing more than that Saul and his sons should be with Samuel in *Sheol*, where there is no knowledge or device, &c., i. e., in the state of the unconscious dead; which was not "to speak false [but truly] of the intermediate state."

Ps. 16 : 10 is next introduced. "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, (sheol or hades); neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life;" &c.

I understand our friend to admit that the *soul* of our blessed Lord was actually in *hades* or *sheol*, for these are synonymous terms. It follows that his *soul* was in a state where "there is no work nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom." Eccl. 9 : 10; i. e., in a state of *unconsciousness*, for where there is *consciousness* there is *knowledge*. This settles the point, unless we deny the Bible definition of *sheol* and *hades*. Bro. H. asks, "But was his body in hades?" I answer yes, verily; his entire person was there, in the unconsciousness and insensible state of the dead. In marvellous wisdom and love, our Father gave his own Son, *soul and body*, to die for us. "By the sacrifice of HIMSELF," and not an inferior part of himself (a mere human body) hath he "put away sin." Heb. 9 : 26. His *soul* was made "an offering for sin;" Isa. 53 : 10. "His own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree;" 1 Peter 2 : 24. The import of these divine testimonies is, that THE ENTIRE LIFE of the Son of God was sacrificed for the sins of the world.

Eccl. 12 : 7, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." The reference is manifestly to Gen. 2 : 7. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Scripture is its own best interpreter. At death, "the dust, "of which MAN was "formed," returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit, i. e., the breath (by which the man became a living soul,) returns to God who gave it. Br. H. remarks, "If the spirit is owned by Him from whom it came, without having become a part of Him, it must have a separate existence." Certainly, the breath or spirit of life which, like all created things, "came" from God, is no part of the uncreated Jehovah. But I ask our brother, if he means to assert that the breath, or spirit breathed into man's nostrils as the cause of life, which leaves him at a particular period, and thus causes his death, is itself a surviving conscious soul, a distinct conscious entity? If not, the passage presents him no proof of his opinion.

The original terms, *nesme, nephish, ruach, psyche,* and *pneuma*, translated soul, spirit, mean *breath* or *life*. See Taylor, Parkhurst, &c., on the words. The terms translated soul and spirit, are applied to the lower animals, Gen. 1 : 20. In the 30th verse "every thing that creepeth on the earth, wherein there is life," is in the Hebrew said to have "a living soul." See margin. Eccl. 3 : 19, 21; the same term (ruach) is applied both to man and beast; "yea, they have all one breath," which proves that the breath God breathed into man's

nostrils originally, was the same which he gave the beasts. If man has an independent, surviving, distinct, conscious entity, we must either deny the divine testimony that, in respect to death, "MAN hath no pre-eminence above a beast;" or that the latter also possesses such a distinct surviving entity.

We respectfully assure our brother that we humbly conceive, that, so far, he has offered us no evidence to induce us to accept an opinion which we believe to have originated in heathen philosophy, and which divests the glorious doctrine of the resurrection of its chief importance. We must still believe that as the dying Savior was shown no "path of life," but by a resurrection from the dead, Ps. 10 : 11 ; Acts 2 ; 31 ; so his followers will find none other. Yours for the truth,

HENRY GREW.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY 1, 1854.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH the LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor.—Having proved from the Bible that God and angels are pure spirits, unconnected with bodily form or organs, I shall proceed in the present number to show that man is a compound being, consisting of a spirit united with a material body. But before I proceed it is at least respectful in me to notice your last rejoinder.

1. You still insist that the fact that there are pure spirits in the universe, has nothing to do with the question. And yet, you yourself show, by the arguments that immediately follow, that this is really the main question involved in the discussion. If there are no purely spiritual natures, how could such a nature be "superadded" to the material body of Adam? You, sir, hold that mind or intelligence is, in all cases, the result of animal organization, and that, consequently, when the human body is dissolved by death, the soul ceases to exist. In opposition to this, I affirm that mind or intelligence is *not* the result of animal organization, and that therefore the soul does not become extinct at the death of the body. And in proof of my first main position, I proceed to show that God is a SPIRIT, without bodily form or organs; and that consequently your view of the nature and dependency of spirits must be false. And yet you assert over and over again that my argument has nothing to do with the question! But suppose it to be true, as the Bible declares, that "God is a SPIRIT," that he maketh his angels SPIRITS, and that devils are unbodied "SPIRITS?" Would it not be fully settled that spirits *can* and *do* exist without bodies? And if spirits can exist without bodies, and the Bible teaches that "there is a spirit in man," would it not be clear that his spirit also might exist still though the body was dissolved? Most assuredly; and I am at a loss to account for your repeated insinuations that the points I have hitherto urged have no bearing upon the question.

2. Of Jehovah you say—"His essential nature he has never seen fit to reveal." What then, does this passage mean, "GOD IS A SPIRIT," John 4, 24? To what does it refer? To the attributes of God, or to his essential nature? If this text does not reveal the "essential nature" of God as a pure spirit, unconnected with bodily form or organs, pray tell us what it does mean. It will avail you little to assert that *you* do not know what is here meant by the term "*spirit*," and to insinuate in every number that there is something peculiar in "my definition," or my "notion" of a spirit. You well understand my definition—that a pure spirit is an intelligent, conscious, entity or essence, unconnected with material form or organs. Such I affirm to be the nature of God, because it is said that he is "a SPIRIT." And now you affect not to know what the word, "*spirit*" means! You know nothing of the nature of God, from the fact that he is a "SPIRIT!" That term conveys no idea to *your* mind, above that of some refined material substance like light or electricity or magnetism!

If such are your views of the meaning of the term "spirit," I think you ought, before we go any further, to define the term "*soul*" which you have inserted in the proposition under discussion. What do you mean by a "*soul?*" Is this too, like one of your spirits, an entity with a body and its organs? And do you expect me to attempt to prove that *such* a soul was superadded to the body of Adam? i. e. one body added to another?

3. You say, "Suppose it was admitted that God is immaterial, uncompounded, &c., will that prove that *created* beings must be so too?" Certainly not, unless it be asserted that they too, are, in this respect like God. But it *is* asserted that angels and men, though created beings, are *spirits* as well as God. Hence if God is immaterial and uncompounded, because he is a spirit, men and angels as spirit must also be immaterial and uncompounded. My argument is based, not upon the single fact that God is a spirit, but also upon the revealed fact that angels and devils are spirits also, and as I shall hereafter show, that men are, in one nature, spirits.

4. After all, you proceed to argue that God has a body and parts, because he has *manifested* himself to the bodily senses of men. Well, which of the forms, in which he has manifested himself, will you select as the *permanent* or *essential* form of God? Is it the *fire* in the bush—the *cloven tongues*—the *shekinah* over the mercy seat—the *cloudy pillar*—the *human form*, or the *dove*? Is it possible that because God has condescended to address the *eye* and *ear* of mortals in order to communicate with them, that you have concluded that

he is a *material being*, notwithstanding his express declaration that he is a SPIRIT?

And if your logic as to the angels be sound, then God must be all he has *appeared* to be—a *fire*—a *cloud*—a *dove*—all these, or else he is a "hypocrite!" For if angels are "*hypocrites*" unless they are just what they appeared to be, then the Holy Ghost must be a *fire* and a *dove*, &c., unless he is a hypocrite. Such are the conclusions to which your logic inevitably conducts us.

That man is a compound being, consisting of two essentially different natures—a material body and an immaterial spirit—is proved first, by the history of the creation of the first man, and by every analysis of his nature furnished in the Holy Scriptures. The history of his creation is recorded Gen. ii. 7, in these words:—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here we have,

1. The body made of dust. There it lies, perfect in all its parts, but cold and motionless. The eye has not seen nor the ear heard. The nerves have never felt, the lungs respired, nor the heart throbbed. And why not? Is not the organism perfect? It is not like a watch that must first be wound up, for it is not a mere machine, driven by weights or springs, and if mind is the result of organization, and that is now perfect, why does not the brain *think*, the heart *feel*, and the eye *see*? For the same reason that telescopes never see, nor ear trumpets hear. The intelligent conscious spirit is not yet there. The "man" formed of dust is simply a human body, inanimate and lifeless.

2. The next step in the process is the vivifying or animation of this man of dust. God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul." That this act was the infusion of a spiritual nature into the body of Adam, is evident from the following considerations:

(1.) The phrase "breath of life," is rendered "breath of LIVES" by all Hebrew scholars. Not only did animal life then begin, but another and higher life which constituted him, not only a mere animal, but a "living SOUL." He was a body before,—he is now more than a body, a "soul" and body united. If he was a "soul" before, then how could he become such by the last act of his creation? And if he was not a soul before, but now became one, then the soul must have been "superadded" to his former material nature.

(2.) If it be said that "the breath of life" was simply his natural breath, with which God inflated his lungs, then a pair of bellows had answered just as good a purpose as the breath of the Almighty; and the whole transaction is degraded and caricatured.

(3.) As if to illustrate this very process of the first creation, when Christ would infuse the Holy Spirit upon his disciples he breathed upon them. "And when he had said this he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' John xx. 22. Now if the Spirit of God infused to induce spiritual life, is communicated by breathing upon its recipients, is it unreasonable to suppose that the human spirit of Adam was thus infused at the first? Is not this the divine prosess of superadding spirit to beings in whom it does not exist?

(4.) The Scriptures every where recognize the philosophical distinction between the body and the spirit, and the two-fold nature of man.

Isa. 31: 3, "Now the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh and not spirit."

Here the distinction between *flesh* and *spirit* is as strongly marked as that between man and God.

Job 32: 8, "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." Here the material man is one thing, and the spirit "in" this man is another; and intelligence or "understanding" is not a result of animal organization, but of the inspiration of God. And what inspiration have all men in common, if it be not inspiring the mortal body with its tenant spirit.

Numbers 16: 22, and 27: 16, God is declared to be the "God of the spirits of all flesh." But what can this mean if spirit and flesh are the same? And what can the phrase "the spirits of all flesh" mean, if it be not that man has a spirit in him distinct from his "flesh" or "body."

Job. 14: 22; "But his flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn." Here also the "flesh" and "soul" are distinct—the flesh is "upon him," or envelopes the soul, and the soul is "within him," or in his body. And these two—the "flesh" without and the "soul" within—constitute the man.

Zech. 12: 1, it is said that God "formeth the spirit of man within him." The "spirit within him" and the "man" which it is in, are as distinct as the house and the person in the house.

Rom. 8: 16, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit," &c. But why speak of "our spirit" if we have no spirit distinct from the body?

1 Cor. 2: 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?" Here, again, we have the same doctrine—the "spirit of man" distinguished from his body in which it dwells,—and intelligence wholly denied to the material organization, and attributed to the spirit alone.

1 Cor. 6: 20, "For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and spirit, which are God's." The same distinction is here again repeated. The "body" and "spirit" are two different natures, both of which "are God's," and in both of which we are to glorify Him. So 2 Cor. 7: 1, we are to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, &c."

2 Cor. 4: 16, "For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

Now what could the apostle have meant by the "outward man," if it was not the body? and what by the "inward man" if it was not "the spirit of man that is in him?" How *can* such scriptures be reconciled to the idea that man has no soul distinct from his animal organization?

2 Cor. 12: 23, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, whether in the body, I cannot tell, or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth, such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, whether in the

body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth."

But if the theology of Paul was that men have no souls distinct from their bodies, how is it that he could not tell whether he was in the body or out? And what means this jargon about "in the body and out of the body," if the soul and body are one, and no soul ever got "out of" a body, or ever can?

But I must forbear for the present. Though the history of the creation of Adam does not in terms declare that the spirit was "superadded" to the body, yet it does declare that by the second act of God—the "inspiration of the Almighty"—he became what he was not before—a "*living* SOUL." Unless, therefore, he could be all that he was before, and "become" much more, without addition, it is demonstrated that his soul was "superadded" to the material body by this act of God.

So much for the synthetic argument, or that drawn from the history of the origin of man. Though brief, like the entire history of creation, it clearly teaches the two-fold nature of man. But the true method for determining the nature or composition of any substance is by resolution or analysis. Take it apart, and see if it consists of different elements. So of man: the history of his origin is contained in a few lines; but when we come to his analysis the scriptures are full and explicit. And if I can show that he now consists of *two natures*, essentially distinct—a material *body* and an immaterial *spirit*—it fully settles the question as to how he was made at the first; for if he is now a spirit and body united, they must have been united in the first man; and if his body of dust was first made, the spirit must have been superadded to the body.

Having adduced a specimen of those numerous passages which teach the distinction between the body and the soul, and the two-fold nature of man, I pause, and await your reply.

H. MATTISON.

New York, June 27.

Response by the Editor.

Our friend takes it upon himself, in every article, to tell what the Editor of the Examiner "holds." We really wish he would spare himself that trouble; especially when we have uttered no such sentiment as he attributes to us. For example—he says—at the opening of the foregoing article—"You hold that mind or intelligence is, *in all cases*, the result of *animal* organization." Now, we "hold" no such thing; and we never uttered such a sentiment. Again, the Prof. asks—"If there are no purely spiritual natures, how could such a nature be 'superadded' to the material body of Adam?" We have not said any such nature was superadded; or that any other nature entered into the constitution of the creature man than what the record affirms: it is for the Professor to establish that another nature, or entity, called the soul was superadded.

The Professor next "affirms that mind or intelligence is *not* the result of animal organization, and that therefore the soul does not become extinct at the death of the body." Thus he *assumes* that man has an entity called "the soul," instead of proving it, and if his affirmation is true all animals, which manifest "mind or intelligence," as certainly as man, have souls that do not become extinct at the death of their bodies. We will not say he "holds" that doctrine, but it is the legitimate result of his assumption.

The Professor manifests great anxiety to get us to admit "that spirits can and do exist without bodies." We neither admit nor deny it at this time, because we regard that as a distinct question. We think however we said enough in our last to show that some spirits—even angels—"eat;" and until he can show that "mind or intelligence" *eats* "fatted calves and manna"—which angels did eat—all his assumptions of their entire disconnection with matter will pass for what they are worth in thinking minds. We will, however, just name one text for Br. M.'s consideration, on the question of spirits. Our Savior saith, Luke 20th, "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the *resurrection* from the dead . . . are *equal* unto the angels." Now, as the resurrected ones have some *bodies*, and are not "pure spirits," as the Professor defines that phrase, does it not seem to follow that angels have some kind of bodies, and are not those bodiless beings our friend supposes? This is only a hint to Br. M. that he may not think we intend to slight anything he says, even though it is foreign to the argument.

The Professor seems anxious that we should tell him what that "passage does mean, 'God is a spirit.'" Whatever it does mean, it does not mean that a "superadded entity called the soul" was placed in *the man* which the "Lord God formed of the dust of the ground:" nor is it any proof that Br. M.'s definition of spirit is a true one, but that point we shall not discuss now.

If the Professor wants a *definition* of "the term soul, inserted in the proposition under discussion," he is doubtless able to give one himself. So long as we have not undertaken to affirm there is any such superadded entity in the man, formed of the dust of the ground, it will not be expected we shall undertake to give a definition of it.

The Professor says, we have undertaken "to argue that God has body and parts." We have undertaken no such thing; and our readers will see, by referring to our last reply, that we undertook no such business; we only threw out a sug-

gestion to show that the Prof.'s definition of spirit had another side to it, but declined all "argument" on that question. He says, "If your logic as to the angels be sound, then God must be all he has *appeared* to be—a fire—a cloud—a dove—all three, or else he is a 'hypocrite!' For if angels are hypocrites," unless they are just what they appeared to be, then the Holy Ghost must be a fire, a dove, &c., unless he is a hypocrite!"

If we were disposed to enter into the discussion about God, we could easily show that Br. M. has dealt entirely in assumptions in these remarks. In the first place we did not say that angels "*are* just what they *appeared to be*;" but, "*they did eat*;" Gen. 18: 8, and other places: and "man did eat *angel's food*;" Psa. 78: 25. Hence, angels *do* the *act* of eating, and must have "organs" suited to such *acts*. As to God's "appearing to be a fire, a cloud, or a dove," if all that were true, it is no parallel to the case of angels we gave: but it may be a question admitting dispute whether God ever "appeared to be" any such thing; and if this were the place we should be perfectly willing to take issue with the Professor on that assumption of his; but as he has at length approached the question at issue we shall attend to the appropriate discussion before us.

On the question at issue the Professor seems to employ the terms soul and spirit as synonymous, or as expressing the same thing. We do not so regard them; nor does the Bible usage warrant such an amalgamation, in our judgment. Take three examples—"For the *spirit* should fail before me, *and* the *souls* I have made;" Isa. 57: 16. Again, 1 Thess. 5: 23 "Your whole spirit *and* soul." Also Heb. 4: 12—"Dividing asunder of soul *and* spirit." Thus soul and spirit seem not to be what the Professor assumes—identical, or synonymous. It is not obligatory on us to show wherein the difference lies, it is enough to show there is a marked distinction, in Bible usage, between them. Other "Professors" admit this difference and contend for it; among them Prof. Bush. Hence, at the outset, if man is "a compound being" consisting of more than one "nature" he would seem to have *three* instead of "two," as Prof. M. affirms; but such an admission perhaps might not be acceptable to him.

The Professor's argument for a "superadded entity, called the soul," embraces two parts—*first*, The account of man's creation; and *second*, inferences drawn from certain expressions in Scripture; but not one positive text is produced to sustain him; he finally admits he must prove his position by "analysis," or taking man "apart;" and it is quite likely by the time he has finished that work he may find nothing tangible left but the dust of the ground out of which "the Lord God formed man."

We now proceed with his view of man's creation. To save quoting his language the reader will observe that the figures, numbering our paragraphs are used corresponding to his figures, and so can refer back to his remarks.

"1." We never said that "mind is the result of organization" merely: we never held that the "inanimate and lifeless" *man* could "think," &c.; but, Did that lifeless man need another "entity called the soul superadded" to cause him to think? or was the "breath of life," common to all other animals, sufficient, and alone the cause of a perfect organism evolving thought? If the Professor's reference to a telescope is valid, then the man, formed of the dust, never did see nor hear, either before he became living nor since; putting an astronomer to look through a telescope does not make it see. According to the Professor the man formed of the dust of the ground was the *cage*, and the "intelligent conscious spirit" is the *prisoner*, who however never did see nor hear, nor possess consciousness till it was caged. The cage then must be the most important part of the creation. A poor blind, deaf, and helpless soul that, truly. No wonder inspiration gives us a particular account of the creation of the cage, and says nothing of the creation of such a blind and sightless thing as this imaginary soul, that did not, and it seems could not, see till a cage was made for it. How unlikely to see when its cage is lost.

"2." The imparting of the breath of life to the dust-made man "was the infusion of a spiritual nature into the body of Adam," saith the Professor. Thus Br. M. differs with Paul, who saith of Adam, "that was not first which is *spiritual*; and adds—"The first man is of the earth earthy." See 1 Corinth. 15: 46, 47.

"(1.)" The Professor tells us the "phrase 'breath of life' is rendered 'breath of *lives*' by all Hebrew scholars." We do not object to the rendering, but accept it. What then? Does the Professor's *inference* follow as truth? By no means. Did his immaginary "spiritual nature," or "intelligent spirit," live by the breath of lives? If so, it must have some "organs," which the Prof. says spirits have not. The phrase "breath of lives," so far from indicating man's possessing another nature than an animal one, is just the phrase to disprove it. All other animals were created before man, and their breath was in their "nostrils,"—see Gen. 9: 21, 22—they lived by

breathing; and man, when the same breath was infused into his nostrils, lived by the same common element—it was the "breath of *lives*"—that by which all animal life was sustained, and there is no indication of any other or different life being imparted to man than what was imparted to all other animals. Solomon declares that men and animals "all have one breath."—Eccl. 3: 19. Hence it is a mere assumption that the phrase, breath of lives, imports two distinct lives imparted to man at his creation. *Man* became a *living* soul by the impartation of the breath of life to him by his Creator; and not by placing another entity in him, called the soul. He did not become "a soul" —as the Prof. assumes—by that breath imparted. He *was* a soul before—not indeed, a theological one, but a Bible soul, though as yet without life. He "became a *living* soul" by the life-imparting breath common to all breathing creatures.

On the text, Gen. 2; 7, we commend the following extract to the attention of our friend Mattison:—"Some of our readers," writes the late learned 'Rev. J. Pye Smith, D.D., F.R.S., F.G. S.,' "may be surprised at our having translated *nephesh hhaya* by *living animal*. There are good interpreters and preachers who, confiding in the common translation, *living soul*, have maintained that here is intimated the distinctive pre-eminence of man above the inferior animals, as possessed of an immaterial and immortal spirit. . . . WE SHOULD BE ACTING UNFAITHFULLY IF WE WERE TO AFFIRM ITS BEING CONTAINED OR IMPLIED IN THIS PASSAGE."—*Kitto's Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., Art. Adam.*

"(2)" We pass the Prof.'s "pair of bellows" to carry their own weight, or wind.

"(3.)" The illustration of Christ's breathing on his disciples, and saying, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" does not avail our Prof., unless he can prove two things—*first*, that our Lord imparted to them a *third* nature, by dividing the Spirit of God into several parts; and *second*, that this third nature was imparted at the time of the breathing, as in the case of Adam. Neither of these points are self-evident, but the reverse. Besides, his illustration is defective from the fact that it is altogether unlike the transaction he brings it to illustrate. The Lord did not say to Adam, when he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, "Receive ye" an immortal soul! Had He done so the Prof. would have had little difficulty with the subject. Jesus did not breathe into the "nostrils" of his disciples the promised gift; but we have a particular account how they received it some days after it was promised—it *fell* upon them—was *poured* out upon them, &c., but we have no account that Adam received at the time of the breathing, or at any subsequent period, such a soul as the Prof. affirms. There is nothing in the transaction to give countenance to the assumption that the Lord God breathed an entity called the soul into man at his creation; and the difference in the two transactions is self-evident.

"(4,)" the Scriptures no "where recognise" *such* a "distinction" as theologians make in the constitution of man. That man is possessed of body and spirit is true. But is that spirit a superadded entity, or being, called the soul? a living, conscious existence? "The distinction between flesh and spirit" we do not question any more than the distinction between the *wood* and *sap* of a tree. If the Prof. had a thousand texts to that point it would not help him in the least. His first four texts, therefore, just avail him nothing, yet we will make a passing remark on Job. 32: 8, "There is a spirit in man," &c. Now what constitutes *man*? The Prof. says, "Man is a compound being, consisting of two essentially different natures," &c. Then neither of these natures *alone* can be man; hence the spirit in man cannot be a distinct entity, but goes to make part of a whole. Prof. Bush, in his description of the term spirit, as used in the Bible, puts this text in the class signifying "mind, viewed as the seat and subject of thought, but more especially of emotion, feeling, passion, and affection." There is a *mind* in man—or man is a creature of mind, and hence capable of receiving understanding from his Creator. But what has this to do with the Prof.'s assumption of its being a superadded entity to man? Observe—This spirit is *in man;* and the text does not say the inspiration of the Almighty giveth *it* understanding, but "giveth *him* [*the man*] understanding." Man's mind is so developed through the living organization God has given him, that he is capable of receiving understanding, and God imparts it to "him."

The Prof.'s remarks on Job 14: 22, are a thorough refutation of his own theory, we think. He says, "the flesh and soul are distinct—the flesh is upon him, or encompass the soul." Then, is not the soul the *him?* But, adds the Prof., "The soul is within *him:*" so, logically, the soul is within the soul. No, adds the Prof., "in his body." So, now the body is the *him*, and as the "flesh is upon him," the flesh is upon the flesh, because it is "*upon him.*" No, saith the Prof., seemingly aware of the dilemma he is in," "The flesh without and the soul within constitute *the man.*" Then the soul is not an entity of itself, and the Prof.

subverts his own theory; at least, so it appears to us.

On Zech. 12: 1, the Prof. says, "It is said that God 'formeth the spirit of man within him.' The 'spirit within him,' and the 'man' which it is in, are as distinct as the house and the person in the house."

The Prof. had just said, "the flesh without and the soul within constitute *the man*." If so, then the soul and spirit are as distinct as the man and the house. He had just told us what constitutes the man, viz., "flesh and soul." Now he tells us, the spirit is as distinct from *the man* as the house and the person in the house; thus he has fairly separated the soul and spirit, and lost all claim to using them as synonymous terms, as he has attempted to do. Whatever he may prove about spirit hereafter will not help him to sustain the affirmative of the question at issue, for that is about an "entity called the soul." Hence, all the texts that follow in his argument based on the term spirit are irrelevant to the question; nevertheless we shall notice some of them, premising that the term spirit is often used in the sense of *mind* in the scriptures. Prof. Bush gives some fifty examples of this use in his work on "THE SOUL," &c., and many more might be added.

Prof. M. asks, on Rom. 8: 16, "Why speak of 'our spirit' if we have no spirit distinct from the body?"

When the apostle said "our spirit," was it his body that uttered the sentiment? If not, was it his spirit that uttered it? If so, then it seems his spirit had a spirit. The truth is, this form of expression proves no such thing as the Prof. assumes. It is a simple and emphatic form of expressing our *consciousness* of the approbation of God: the mind perceiving the things of God by the help of the Spirit of God. The same is true of his text, 1 Cor. 2: 11; neither of them assert the spirit of man to be a distinct entity from the man; and the apostle adds, in the last text, "*even so* the things of God knoweth no man but the spirit of God." Are God and His Spirit two distinct entities, or beings, and entirely unlike each other? Just as truly so as man and his spirit are: and the apostle's "*even so*" settles that point.

The apostle's use of the terms body and spirit, to which the Prof. resorts, in various texts, proves nothing of a superadded entity, called the soul, in man: it is purely an assumption to affirm they do.

The Prof. asks—"What the apostle meant by the 'outward man' if it was not the body? and what by the 'inward man' if it was not 'the spirit of man that is in him?'" The apostle explains his inward man to be his "mind;" see Rom. 7: 22, 23. Though he found himself failing and growing feeble through much labor and suffering, so that his present life was wearing away, he found in his *mind* increasing comfort in God and ground of confidence in Him. Paul saith nothing about his "soul" being renewed or growing stronger "day by day;" and if he had, it would have proved beyond all cavil that the fancied immortal soul was not really immortal; for immortality needs no "renewing," and is totally incapable of such a process. Immortality never decays nor grows feeble, and hence never needs renewing: so that this text makes more against the Prof.'s theory than for it.

The Prof. next brings up the text of a man that did not know whether he was in the body or out of it, as proof that man has a superadded entity called the soul. The Prof. calls this "jargon" if "men have no souls distinct from their bodies," &c.; but it is worthy of remark, that the apostle saith nothing about the man's "soul" *pro* or *con*. A very remarkable omission if the Prof.'s "theology" be true. But the man was not dead, unless the dead are so remarkably *ignorant* as not to know whether they are dead or alive, which the Prof.'s theological school will not admit; for that maintains "the dead know more than all the world." But Paul did not know whether the man he speaks of was in the body or out—therefore, supposing Paul to be the man spoken of, he *did know* that he could not be *dead*, because such ignorance as Paul speaks of cannot consist with the supposed increased knowledge of a dead man.—There is but one alternative for the Prof.'s school here. As Paul did know the man spoken of was not dead, it follows, if the fancied soul was "out of the body," a man can part with his soul and still his body be alive; and thus it would be demonstrated that the fancy soul is not the life-giving element in man, and the Prof.'s theory of the cause of man's life, at creation, falls to the ground.

All that the apostle here says amounts to just this, viz.: A vision was made to a man in a way of which he could give no account, and knew not whether he was taken up bodily, like Ezekiel, Ezk. 8: 3, to see and hear, or whether he was transported mentally, in some undefinable manner. He saith not one word of soul or spirit in the transaction; but it was the *man* to whom the vision was made. This text, then, affords no support to the Prof.'s position of a "superadded entity, called the soul, to the creature man, which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground."

Finally, the Prof. has to admit that "the his-

tory of the creation of Adam does not in terms declare that the spirit was superadded to the body" —[*to the man*, Prof.]—"yet," saith he, "it does declare that by the second act of God—he became what he was not before—a *living* soul." Very true, Br. M., he was first a *lifeless* soul, then, by the inspiration of breath into his nostrils he became a LIVING soul, or creature. He—the man, made of dust—now *lived* by breathing, just as did every other living creature the Lord God made out of the ground. See Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30, compared with chap. 2: 7, 19. Thus the Prof.'s "demonstration" does not even approach a probability of the truth of his theory.

In conclusion, we ask the Prof. to favor us with his articles at an earlier period, if he wishes us to reply in the same number, as he said he did. His last article, as its date shows, was not received till it was time the EXAMINER should go to press; and hence our response must be written in great haste, if at all, to accompany it. The Prof. can afford to be generous in this matter as he has the popular side of the question; yet we too can afford to be generous because we have the consciousness of the truth on our side.

THE VOICE OF WARNING.

"And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the son of man."—Luke 21: 34–36.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

On the meaning of the terms employed in this text we submit the following remarks. The term translated "take heed" signifies, "to beware of—guard against." "Overcharged," signifies "overload; weigh down; oppress." "Heart," the "mind; affections," &c. "Surfeiting," includes "excesive eating; excess generally." "Drunkeness," includes "intemperance" in general. "Cares," means "anxieties; solicitude." "Unawares," signifies "unforeseen; unexpected; sudden." "Come upon"—to assault; to be impending." "That"—*ekenee*—"that there; that one." The original words, in the text, warrant these different expressions. We offer the following general remarks upon the text:

1. A particular day is spoken of.
2. It involves vast and important interests.
3. It will come when men generally are not looking for it.
4. It seems likely to arrive in a time of plenty.
5. Also, when temptations are many to worldly pursuits and gratifications.
6. It will be a fatal day to many.
7. To escape its calamities we must "take heed" to "ourselves"—beware—be on our guard—"lest our hearts," minds, affections, be overloaded—have a weight upon them that unfits or disables them for that labor and preparation which are necessary to fit us to "stand"—be approved—"before," or in the presence of "the Son of Man."

This unfitness, or disability, may be produced—

1. By *excess in eating*—"surfeiting"—made dull, or heavy, so as not to desire, look for, or *see that day* in its approach.

2. By *drunkeness*. This includes the idea of revelling, and intemperance in any matter.

3. By "*cares of this life*"—anxieties, solicitude. These are the more dangerous because some care is *unavoidable* and necessary. It is not against *all care* that our Saivor warns us; but against being "*overcharged*," or overloaded, so as to be weighed down, and thus not *looking* for "*that day*." He warns us that it will come "*unawares*" to some; that is, *unforeseen, unexpected*, and hence "sudden," "as a snare."

That it prove not a fatal day to us, he warns us not only to "take heed," but also, to "watch and pray;" and to do this "always"—at all times.

It is only in obedience to our Lord's command and injunction that we have any ground to hope that we shall "*escape*" the coming calamities of that day; or be accepted of him when he appears.

Let us then take heed "LEST AT ANY TIME" our hearts be overcharged with any of the affairs of *this* life. Let us *beware*—be on our guard. "To them that look for him"—in the way he has thus marked out for us—"shall he appear the second time . . . *unto Life;*" or, to give us life, even eternal life.

ETERNAL TORMENTS.

"No falsehood can last forever. No! although it be buttressed by power, gilded by genius, sanctioned by success, believed by millions, and covered with the hoar of 1600 years, it must sooner or later die. Men at last discover their delusion, and they rise up to destroy it with a vehemence of indignation proportioned to the length of time it has lasted, and to the depth of the hold it has usurped over their hood-winked minds."—*Geo. Gilfillan.*

In a "Gospel Catechism for Children" by the Rev. J. Morison, we find the following query and reply:—"Why is it that the unholy must abide in the devil's hell for ever and ever? The unholy must abide in the devil's hell for ever and ever, and never be released, because without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins; and for the sins which they commit after they leave the earth, Christ never did, and never will die."—*Ques.* 184.

By "the devil's hell," the reverened author means "the everlasting fire" to which the finally impenitent, along with the devil and his angels,

are consigned at the great day of judgement. He *assumes* that the ungodly shall exist forever in these quenchless flames, that instead of being consumed by the fiery element, they shall, while eternity continues its round, be preserved alive amid the most fearful horrors and excruciating pains, for ever tossing on the angry billows of "shoreless woe."

To the enquiry, why is it that the ungodly must abide forever in this awful place, the answer given is substantially this, in an afterstate, the ungodly will commit sins which God has determined not to forgive. Truly, this is the most extraordinary apology for eternal torments it has been our lot to see or hear. So, then, men are to be punished with everlasting torments, not for transgressions done in the present, but for sins done in a future life; not for crimes on earth, but for sins in hell! Where in all the world did the learned gentleman obtain this information? For our part we know of no passage of Scripture which affirms that the ungodly are to be punished in hell for sins committed there; and while we have a very high estimate of the learning and ability of the respected individual whose statements we are considering, we are by no means prepared to receive as true, so important a declaration, on any authority short of Scripture testimony; in the absence of such confirmation; we might simply, dismiss the case with a verdict of—not proven. But we are not disposed so to let the matter pass: we not only want evidence of the statements being *true*,—we have evidence of its being FALSE. *First*, The only punishment threatened in Scripture to the ungodly in the future world is for "the deeds done in the body;" the wicked are represented as being sent away to everlasting punishment, for sins they had committed in the present state of being. *Secondly*, The Bible represents the future punishment of the lost in such terms as "death—destruction—everlasting destruction—perdition—a being burned up like chaff and decayed vine branches—utterly perishing like brute beasts in their own corruption—being consumed, and vanishing into smoke like the fat of lambs," terms which necessarily preclude the idea of eternal preservation. The argument we are now considering is another clear evidence of of the pitiful necessities to which the orthodox are driven in their attempts to defend their pet theory of unending suffering,—another of their miserable shifts to make the doctrine of eternal misery appear somewhat compatible with reason and justice. Pressed with the idea that an eternity of suffering is out of all proportion as a punishment for the sins men commit during a life-time, seldom extending beyond eighty years; that it appears something like cruelty and injustice to inflict unending misery on such a frail being as man is, surrounded from his birth by powerful and too-well adapted temptations to evil, yea, indeed, as the more orthodox affirm, being himself corrupt by nature, born with a bias towards evil; they have endeavored to render their theory somewhat feasible by affirming that the ungodly will be kept in "the devil's hell for ever," not for iniquities done here, but because, while bearing the punishment of sins done on earth, they will continue to transgress, and each new transgression calling for its own punishment, they shall thus go on sinning and suffering forever and evermore. And yet, after all, this view of the case, instead of presenting it as rationally defensible, only, if that were possible, makes the matter worse, for, be it observed, this continual persistance in sin is represented as part of the penal inflictions for sins done on earth, that is, the sinner is judicially sent, for trespasses committed in time, to a place of torment, where all saving and sanctifying influences are denied him; where, thus shut out from all hope and unchangeably surrounded by other beings as wicked, if not more so, than himself, he must remain as vile, nay, from the necessities of his nature, become progressively more corrupt, and thus his everlasting misery is inevitably insured. How the advocates of this horrid system can represent God as treating his erring creatures thus, and, at the same time, believe him to be "the Lord God merciful and gracious," the God of love and the Father of the human race, we cannot very well explain. To us and to many others, such dealings have always appeared incompatible with the attributes of Deity. Over such misrepresentations of our Father in heaven many have stumbled into infidelity, and have been thus cast afloat on the flood without an anchor, and without a helm. On many a pious heart has this hideous and execrable doctrine weighed like an incubus. Thanks be to God, thousands are begining to see him in a new light! and they can exclaim, in reference to his dealings with the incorrigibly impenitant, as well as in regard to the whole circle of his other works, in the presence of the sceptic, "just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints! Thy tender mercy is over all thy works!" *Moncrieff's Expositor.*

From W. Sheldon, Woodstock, Conn.

Br. Storrs:—The great central truths of the Bible are getting a strong foothold throughout the land. The life and death theme cannot be crippled?

My heart has recently been make to rejoice in seeing ministers, deacons, and people embracing this truth. In one place, where I gave several sermons upon this topic, a minister, deacon, and several members took a decided stand for truth; and the community became so aroused that I was enabled to dispose of between forty and fifty copies of my book entitled BIBLE TRUTH DEFENDED,—a work containing 176 pages, devoted principally to this question.

While I contend that the Bible contains a variety of truths, I am more and more convinced that this is the *great foundation truth*, and the most effectual one with which to bombard the enemies camp, especially in new fields.

From Joseph Fairbanks, Farmington, Me.

Br. Storrs—How very strong is tradition. The Gentile churches are constrained to acknowledge that tradition with the Jews, when Christ was on the earth, was stronger, much stronger in their minds than was the truth; and yet, it seems to me that the Gentile churches now are carried away with it to as full an extent, in regard to the immortality of the soul and endless punishment or torture, and still how very hard to get the great

majority to look into the subject. Had I time now I would like to write you more.

From Mrs. M. A. Battersby, Fort Smith, Ark.

Br. Storrs :—We are ale alone here as regards our faith. There are two churches—Presbyterian and Methodist; but the "Divines" studiously avoid discussion: doubtless they feel their inability to withstand the truth. Oh! how thankful we ought to be that we are standing on the rock of eternal truth; and we know that it will sustain us. Yes, dear brother, though we may be denounced by the "orthodox" as fanatics, and by the "wise" as "foolish virgins," because we cannot believe their theories: still, "none of these things move us," while our faith is in His word, "which shall not pass away." We have *bundles* of *light*, every week, which I think had better be put under a bushel. But the EXAMINER, which we value most, comes very irregular. If you can spare us a few moments, please write us a short sermon. You must remember we have no preaching here, and we require to be "put in remembrance. My husband joins with me in love to yourself and wife. Remember us in your prayers, that we may be useful here, in spreading the light. Wishing you every blessing in this life, and that which is to come, I subscribe myself your sister in Christ.

OURSELF ONCE MORE.—The embarrassment which caused our removal, noticed in our last, has also made it necessary to dispense with the "help, in labor about the office," which we contemplated employing. Hence we must labor alone, as before, and cannot travel abroad as we intended. How long we shall be able to do all the work now on our hands we cannot tell; but we are the Lord's, and He will sustain us till our work is done, or till we have accomplished what He has given us to do. We feel no disposition to complain or faint. Hitherto the Lord hath helped us; and we think we are learning to "take no thought for the morrow," knowing that "sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." We are fully settled that much the largest portion of the miseries of human life arise from drawing the anticipated evils of the future into to-day, thus adding an unnecessary load for this day. This is to disobey Christ indeed, who knew our daily evils would be all we could bear, and hence prohibited his followers burdening themselves with anticipated trials in the future. If we will take such trials upon us we must bear the load alone; it is the fruit of disobedience, and we have no claim upon God for help under it.

STILL ADVANCING.—A brother put into our hands a copy of the "Minutes of the New Jersey Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held at New Brunswick," April last.

These minutes were "Published by order of the Conference:" hence are the *official* action of said Conference. We are pleased to see that it is approaching the Scriptural ground of man's state in death. In the notice of the death of one of the Ministers of that Conference it is said—

"HE FELL ASLEEP IN JESUS TO AWAIT THE WAKING OF THE RESURRECTION MORNING."

We had heard it said that "one half of that Conference were *tinctured* with the views held by" those of us who oppose the idea of man's immortality and consciousness in death. The foregoing expression looks very much like its being a fact that they are thus tinctured. These obituary notices are usually read before the Conference and *approved* by it, before they are printed. This being the case, it is strange that the Conference should let such an expression pass—as it must by a *majority* vote—if the majority were not tinctured with our views of the Scripture doctrine on the State of the Dead. They could not but know that such a sentiment, as that they have here put forth, is the very doctrine held by those who believe immortality, eternal life, are only through Jesus Christ, and conferred at "the resurrection morning." We rejoice therefore in the evidence that the truth is advancing on the great question of life only through Jesus Christ by the resurrection, at the last day.

☞ CORRESPONDENTS please direct to us hereafter, in all cases, "GEO. STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*"

RECEIVED FOR THE PROV. COM., to aid in the settlement of its *final* account, from New Bedford, Mass., by John F. Vinal, for himself, $3; for Wm. Whitton, Jr., $5; for Francis Whitton, $1.

DONATIONS since June 15th—Ferdinand Norbert, $4,50: Mrs. M. A. Battersby, $1; Luther Crocker, $3; Wm. H. Barnes, $2.

To the Dying Christian.

BY THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

Farewell! We sorrow not for thee
As those who have no hope:
In Christ thy slumber sweet shall be
Till He shall raise thee up.
In glorious robes thou then shalt shine,
In Jesus' presence *live*,
Surrounded by the host divine,
Glory to God shall give.

Soon shall descend the Lord from heaven—
The dead in Christ shall rise!
Eternal Life will then be given:
All saints will share the prize.
Glorious hope! we then shall meet
Again—no more to part—
With joy undying and complete:
What comfort to our heart.

[See 1 Thess. 4: 13–17.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JULY 15, 1854. NO. 14.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

We take the following extract from an article by J. PANTON HAM, in his *Christian Examiner* for April. It is from his remarks on Prof. Maurice's views of the "State, or Place of the Dead." Br. Ham speaks thus :—

Hades is a compound term, signifying *unseen* or *unknown*, and is thus a negative word, expressing ignorance of the state or place which it is used to denote. Both the words, *Sheol* and *Hades*, have a common representative value, and are invariably and exclusively used in their respective Testaments to denote the state or place of deceased persons. They do not express *an actual locality*, nor *an actual personal condition;* they are the suitable words which the scripture writers employ in speaking of the mysterious change which occurs in death. *Death*, like *life*, is a profound mystery. We speak of *life* as a *coming*, a being; and of *death* as a *going*, and *not being*. The nature of this being, and not being, this coming and going, we do not understand, and therefore do not philosophically describe in our current terminology. We speak not with philosophical accuracy, but in a *figure*, when we speak of the dead as *departed*, as *gone*. They are no longer *with us*, from *us* they have gone,—departed. . . .

1. The Bible informs us that the dead go to *Sheol* or *Hades*, and Hence Sheol or Hades are the Scripture names of the Intermediate State.

Psalm lxxxix. 48.—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? *Shall he deliver his* SOUL *from the hand of Sheol?*" (English version, "Grave.") Eccles. ix. 10.—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol (grave,) whither *thou* goest."

Sheol, translated in our English version sometimes the *grave*, and sometimes *hell*, is in the Old Testament the word which designates the common dormitory of the dead.

2. Sheol is described in emphatic contrast to heaven.

Psalm cxxxix. 8.—"If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol (Hell English ver.) behold thou art there." Amos ix. 2.—"Though they dig into Sheol (Hell, Eng. ver.) thence shall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down." Job xi. 8.—"It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than Sheol (Hell, Eng. ver.) what canst thou know?" Luke x. 15.—"Thou Capernaum which art exalted unto heaven shalt be thrust down to Hades." (Hell, Eng. ver.)

Heaven and *Sheol* or *Hades*, therefore, are widely different places, as widely different as direct contrasts and opposites can be.

3. *Sheol* is represented in the Scripture as *deep in the bowels of the earth.*

Isaiah v. 14.—"Therefore *Sheol* (Hell, Eng. ver.) hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure, and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it." Amos ix. 2—"Though they dig into Sheol," &c, Job xi. 8.—"Deeper than Sheol," &c.

4. Sheol or Hades is spoken of in the Bible *as an evil to be dreaded and deprecated.*

Psalm xvi. 10.—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol." (Hell, Eng. ver.) Also in Acts ii. 27.—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades." (Hell, Eng. ver.) Matt. xvi. 18.—"The gates of Hades (Hell, Eng. ver.) shall not prevail against my Church." 1. Cor. xv. 55.—"O Hades (O Grave, Eng. ver.) where is thy victory."

5. *Sheol* or *Hades* is associated with *death*, and is represented by personification, as sharing the same end, which is, to be destroyed.

Rev. i. 18.—"I have the keys of Hades (Hell, Eng. ver.) and of death." xx. 13.—"Death and Hades (Hell, Eng.ver.) delivered up the dead which were in them." xx. 14.—"Death and Hades(Hell, Eng. ver.) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."

6. *All* persons, *irrespective of character*, are represented as going into *Sheol* or *Hades* at the time of death.

Psalm lxxxix. 48.—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of Sheol? Eccles. ix. 2, 3. —"*All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked*; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean: to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good so is the sinner, and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all." iii. 20.—"*All* go unto *one place.*" ix. 10.—"There is no work, nor device, nor wisdom in Sheol (Eng. ver., the Grave,) *whither thou goest.*"

Here, then, we have the Scripture terms and the characteristics of the intermediate State. *Sheol* or *Hades* according to the Bible is the inter-

mediate dwelling-place of the dead. Now all so-called Evangelical Christians believe in an *intermediate state*, both for the righteous and the wicked. They do not consider that the righteous either enter upon the *full* fruition of their bliss, nor that the wicked undergo the *full* severity of their torment until after the decisions of the Judgment. But they maintain that both classes have the full possession of their consciousness and all their characteristic qualities as human beings, and that to deny that the dead are conscious, is both repulsive and unscriptural. The doctrine of *un*-consciousness in death is pronounced repulsive and unscriptural; let us see whether the doctrine of *consciousness in death* is more attractive and scriptural.

The dead, we have seen, go to Sheol or Hades; and Sheol or Hades we have seen is *not heaven*, but the very *contrast* and *opposite* of heaven. The intermediate state, then, is as unlike heaven as an opposite or contrast can make it. If the righteous dead have consciousness in death, they dwell in a place or state the very *reverse* of heaven.

Sheol or *Hades* is *deep down in the bowels of the earth*, into which "they dig"—where a dying man says, "I make my bed"—whither persons "descend," and are "thrust down," and than which no place is "deeper." Here, then, is the dwelling-place of the righteous dead. If they have consciousness,—if they enter as living separate souls into their intermediate abode, then are they conscious of their deep descent, and their embowelled residence in the womb of the earth.

Again; if the righteous dead go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, they go and remain where David and David's Lord rejoiced that they should not be left (Psalm xvi. 10); they enter within "gates" which presume to "prevail against the Church," as the Church's enemy (Matt. xvi. 18); they come within a power which struggles for the "victory" over the saints of the Most High, and which after the resurrection from the dead shall be hailed with the derisive and triumphant shout, "O *Hades*, where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55.)

If the righteous go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, they go into a state of association with *death* rather than *life*, for we have seen that Death is associated with Sheol or Hades, and both, as personified companions, are figuratively represented as hereafter destroyed together.

Finally, if the righteous go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, then are they in *personal* companionship with the dead, bad as well as good, for "all go unto one place." The society they hate and dread there they commingle with, and must be the sad spectatbrs and auditors of their woe. Weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth add their woeful notes of discord to distract the harmony of the saints' praises. To sing the songs of Zion in such society, and under such circumstances! Who does not deprecate this?

If there is a state of conscious life for mankind *in* death, then that conscious life must be possessed IN SHEOL OR HADES; and we have seen what are the characteristics of this Intermediate State or Place. If we live in death as separate bodiless souls, we live in this *dreaded Sheol*, which is the very contrast of heaven; which is not *above*, but *deep down, below;* where is not the one loved society of the faithful, but the mixed society of the condemned wicked and the righteous awaiting their full redemption. Will the candid and intelligent reader say that consciousness in death is a good, and to be desired? Will he not rather concur in the opinion that if the Bible declares that *in* death there is *no conscious life* for any man, whether righteous or wicked, it should be hailed as glad tidings of joy, and as a motive for devoutest gratitude to God, who has saved us from the consciousness of that gloomy condition into which sin has plunged us? To have consciousness *in* death, since all the dead go to Sheol or Hades, is to have a prospect more revolting than any it is possible to conceive on earth. The intermediate state, as it is exhibited in Scripture, if a conscious one, is a dismal purgatory, the anticipation of which invests the season of death with unspeakable gloominess. Let the believer in a state of life for the bodiless soul in an intermediate state, be apprized of this fact, that the intermediate state of the Bible is Sheol or Hades. He is accustomed, we know, to conceive of this state as one of purest and most felicitous enjoyment, and to describe it by the most glowing and beautiful imagery. Poetry has lent her creative imagination to portray its veiled glories, and by her fascinating genius has transformed the messenger of death into an angel of light, and corruption into the beauty and perpetuity of immortal being. But uninspired poetry must not be permitted to dictate our creed. *The Bible exhibits another picture.* It may, in the opinion of some, be a gloomier picture, but it is the *true* picture, of the state of the dead. The light which the Bible emits is the light of life and immortality *beyond*, not *in* death—a light whose glory shines even unto us on this side the grave, and cheers us in the view of the darkness of "the shadow of death," through which we must pass ere the full splendor of its brightness dazzles our waking vision. And is this a gloomier picture? Is it better that we should be *conscious* of the darkness of *Sheol*—of its distance from heaven—of its pit-like prison—of its resemblance to death—of its mixed society? Who will affirm this? Surely none? If I must die, let me not know what death is! Let the moment of its temporary victory be the moment when my consciousness shall expire, and my sleep be most perfectly sealed! If I must pass through "the valley of the *shadow* of death," let me not descend consciously into the gloom of its impenetrable *darkness*. Let the *approach* of death be the nearest point of concious contact with it; let its *grasp* seize on inanimation and unconsciousness! Is not this the craving of instinct? Does not the personal history of Christ exemplify it? See the Divine Jesus on his way to the grave of Lazarus,—twice does he "groan in himself," and express that he is "troubled." See him in Gethsemane, "in the days of his flesh offering up prayers with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to *save him from death*." . . .

And they who are most like Christ in spirit most participate in his estimate of death. "*Not* that we would be *unclothed*, but *clothed upon*," is

the universal desire of the intelligent Church. Let corruption *put on* incorruption, and mortality *put on* immortality. Let me be "absent from the body"—my present mortal and corruptible constitution—which holds *me*—my personal self—in bondage, even in the grave, and let me be reproduced in a new spiritual and immortal nature, that I may be "present with the Lord" *when* "mortality shall be swallowed up of life." This is the desire both of instinct and religion, and the mercy of God has granted this desire. "Man giveth up the ghost (expires) and where is he? *As* the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so MAN [not the *body* of man, but *man*] lieth down and riseth not; *till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.*" Job xiv. 10—12. Sound and uninterrupted is the sleep of death. "There the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are *at rest*," During the sleeping time death reigns over all that constitutes the living, thinking being called man. But this reign over the saints of God shall be, once and forever, destroyed. . . .

We will conclude by requesting attention to a Scriptural exemplification of the soundness of the argument here set forth. In the 28th chapter of the first book of Samuel we have the account of King Saul's interview at Endor with a woman that had a familiar spirit. This monarch's repeated impieties induced the Lord finally to withdraw from and refuse any counsel to him at a time of eminent personal and national danger. Forsaken by the Lord, he had recourse as a last hope of deliverance to this reputed necromancer, by whose aid he hoped to communicate with his old counsellor and friend, the prophet Samuel, who was then dead. Now mark the phraseology of the narration, and observe how it agrees with the representation of the dead, which has been given above. Having come to the woman by night, Saul said, "I pray thee divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and *bring me* HIM UP whom I shall name unto thee,"—verse 8. "Then said the woman, Whom shall *I bring up* unto thee? And he said unto her, *bring me up* Samuel," verse 11. "And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods *ascending out of the earth.*" "And he said unto her, What form is he of? And she said, *An old man* COMETH UP," 13, 14. "And Samuel said to Saul, why hast thou DISQUIETED ME, *to bring me* UP?" verse 15. "To-morrow *shalt thou and thy sons* BE WITH ME,"—verse 19.

Here, then, the reader will observe, that we have an historical illustration of the state of the dead agreeing in all the chief particulars with the description of the place or state called Sheol or Hades, whither the dead are Scripturally described as going. We have remarked that the state or place of the dead is *below, in the earth*, not above, in the heavens, and hence Samuel is represented as "*ascending out of the earth*,"—as being *brought up* and *coming up*. Sheol or Hades is described as a place or state of profound silence and unconsciousnes,—stillness and repose reign there in undisturbed quietude; hence the appropriateness of the prophet's question—"Why hast thou *disquieted me*, to bring me up? Sheol or Hades, the intermediate state or place of the dead, comprehends all the dead in one *mixed society*. There the righteous and the wicked dwell without distinction and separation; hence the consistency of the prophets language when he pronounced the solemn sentence of God upon the abandoned monarch—"To-morrow *shalt thou and thy sons* BE WITH ME." The wicked Saul and the righteous Samuel are here described as dwelling together in the intermediate state. The prophet Samuel was not in heaven when dead, he was below in the earth; he was not in the holy and active society of angelic beings; he was lying in stillness and quiet in the ground beneath; he was not yet gathered into the garner of God—separated as a sheep from the goats, he was in the one common dormitory of the dead, there awaiting in common with the righteous that potent voice which should bid him arise and enter into life.

We repeat, then, that if there is consciousness for mankind in death—if they go as personal existences in a disembodied form into an intermediate state,—they go into sheol or hades, for *this* is the Intermediate State or Place which the Bible only recognizes; and then so far from consciousness being desirable, it is most to be deplored and deprecated. The intelligent and candid reader will perceive that the terms sheol and hades, and the descriptions which the Bible gives of them are poetical or figurative,—they are images of the region of death. They suitably describe our return in death to our parent earth. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

The following passages contain the Bible doctrine concerning the dead:

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—Ps. 115 : 17. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146 : 4. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything."—Eccl. 9 : 5. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave (Hebrew, Sheol,] whither thou goest."—Eccl. 9 : 10. "They that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, HE shall praise thee as I do this day."—Isa. 38 : 19. See also Ps. 6 : 5; 88 : 10–12; Dan. 12; 2 : Ezek. 37 : 12–14, &c. &c.

Let believers in Christ, then, rejoice that they shall rest in unconscious repose in death, as it is written, "Blessed are the dead which died in the Lord, *for they rest* from their labor and their works do follow them." Soon shall their Lord, as the Resurrection and the Life, come with "the keys of Hades and of Death," to unlock their dark prison house, and set the captives free. "Behold I come quickly." Then will be the fulfillment of his gracious promise, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also."—John 14 : 3. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."—Colos. 3 : 3.

He is a great simpleton who imagines that the chief power of wealth is to supply wants. In a majority of cases it creates more wants than it supplies.

SPIRIT:

Or, the Hebrew Terms "Ruach" and "Neshamah," and the Greek Term "Pneuma."

by rev. wm. glen moncrieff, scotland.

[Continued from page 196.]

Sec. V. Ruach is rendered *vain.*

Job 15 : 2, "Should a wise man utter vain (ruach) knowledge," margin, "knowledge of wind." 16 : 3, "Shall vain (ruach) words (margin, "words of wind") have an end?"

Sec. VI. Ruach is rendered *spirit.*

Every time, with very few exceptions, the word spirit occurs in the Old Testament it is the translation of *ruach.* Our present design requires us only to view it as applied to man, and to attempt a settlement of its import when so used. For the sake of perspicuity we shall endeavor to classify the senses or modes in which it seems to be employed when the discourse is concerning human beings.

1st. Sometimes it imports *life*; meaning by this the animal life, common to man with all the breathing tribes.

Numbers 16 : 22, "O God, the God of the spirits (haruchoth) of all flesh," or men. See also chap. 27 : v. 16. In Ps. 104 : 29 we read, "Thou takest away their breath (rucham) they die and return to their dust," and putting these two verses together, it is not difficult to discover that the import of "spirits" in the first one is just *lives.* Instead of "spirits" the Hebrew term might have been rendered breaths, as in the passage from Psalms; where the singular form of the Hebrew word stands; but lives is clearly its meaning,—lives resulting from breathing, as the radical meaning of *ruach* suggests.

Job 6 : 4, "The arrows of the almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit" (ruchi,) or *life.* See Gesenius' Lexicon. 10 : 12, "Thou hast granted me life, and favor, and thy visitation hath preserved my spirit" (ruchi,) or life. See Gesenius' Lexicon. 27 : 3, "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit (ruchi) of God is in my nostrils." "Once," says Gesenius, "the human spirit, or *life,* is called the 'spirit of God,' as being breathed into man by God, and again returning to God. Gen. 2 : 7, Eccles. 12 : 7, Ps. 104 : 29." The word "spirit" here might with perfect propriety have been exchanged for "breath," as in other places, having under it the idea of resulting life from the respiration of air. The verse might have stood thus, making the second clause a repetition and an expansion of the first—"all the while my breath is in me; and (or even) the breath of God is in my nostrils." His breath was God's breath, inasmuch as it came to him from the Creator, and by its agency he was preserved alive. The margin of the Bible explains the "spirit of God" in the text thus, "the breath which God gave him."

Ps. 76 : 12, "He shall cut off the spirit" (ruach,) or life, "of princes, he is terrible to the kings of the earth." To see that "spirit" here means life, we have only to refer to such expressions as these—Ps. 146 : 4, "His breath (ruchu) goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish;" and Ezk. 37 : 5, "I will cause breath (ruach) to enter into you, and ye shall live," or, I will make you alive by causing you to breathe; and v. 8th of the same chapter—"There was no breath (ruach) in them;" i. e. they were still dead. To cut off the breath, or the "spirit" of princes is to destroy them; and when their life is cut off, their breathing is of course suspended.

Ps. 104 : 4, "Who maketh his angels spirits" (ruchoth.) Who maketh his angels winds, that is, like winds—in rapidity of motion. This seems to us the best interpretation, and the succeeding clause of the verse makes a parallel with it—"his ministers a flame of fire;" i. e. swift as the lightning.

Zech. 12 : 1, "The Lord—which formeth the spirit (ruach) of man within him," literally, in his inwards, or in his belly. On this text we would observe,

a. Since there is no adjective such as living, rational, thinking, mortal, or immortal, prefixed to the *ruach* here, which observe, is not said to be man, but to be in his inwards, we must learn from the radical meaning of the Hebrew term itself, and from other passages, the idea which in a text like this it is employed to express.

b. In itself the word radically means *breath,* and in this sense the passage will run "the Lord formeth the breath of man within him."

c. But as the breath is vitalizing breath, and as whenever it is respired by the lungs, the man through its influence is maintained in life, we apprehend that the import of the term *ruach* in this case is *life,* and perhaps the prophet may have associated with this central thought, the mental and other internal and external phenomena which necessarily result from the respiration of *ruach,* or the life-causing atmosphere. When we find a verse such as this, Ps. 104 : 29, "Thou takest away their breath (rucham) they die and return to the dust," we need not experience difficulty in determining the meaning of the one before us, for it is the same word *ruach,* without the shadow of a discriminating qualification that stands in both texts, and if the removing of the ruach produces death to a man, then by its preservation within him, or by his being preserved breathing it, his life and all its functions and experiences are maintained, and prolonged. This is the *ruach*—life and its wonders—that the Creator forms in man; in other words, putting the secondary cause for the effect, the passage intimates that God makes living men by the simple process of their breathing, and thus also he preserves them manifesting all the various phenomena of animated, conscious existence.

d. Thus, manifestly, the *ruach* of a man is not the man himself, and, though necessary to his life, it has *no life in itself,* though sometimes, on the principle of putting the secondary cause for the effect, life is obviously designated by it. Moreover, were it removed he would remain a perfect man, though without a *ruach,* or spirit, just as the man Adam, who had been formed entirely of dust, was a complete human being before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and so made him

a living being, or an animated human soul. Gen. 2 : 7.

e. To show the utter recklessness, and we can call it nothing else, which has characterized the common exposition of verses like the one before us, let us for an instant consider Ps. 33 : 15, "He fashioneth their hearts alike." Who would infer from this that his heart lives of itself,—that it is a distinct living entity—and is capable of surviving death in consciousness? And why not? Is not thought, purpose, reason, joy, and the like, ascribed to the heart of men? yes, a thousand times and more in the Bible, and no one deals with the term "heart" of man as the *ruach*, "breath" or "spirit" of man has been treated. What is more astonishing, all this exaltation, and sometimes almost deification, of the *ruach* of man, has been done to what is actually *no part even of a human being*, no more than the steam is a part of the engine, or the atmosphere is a part of the furnace it keeps blazing.

2nd. Sometimes "spirit," as the rendering of *ruach*, imports *physical strength;* inasmuch as physical strength results from breathing.

Gen 45 : 27. "The spirit (ruach) of Jacob their father revived." Judges 15 : 19, "When he had drunk, his spirit (ruchu) came again and he revived." 1 Sam. 30 : 12, "And when he had eaten his spirit (ruchu) came again to him, for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights.

3rd. Often it designates *mental* or *moral qualities* or *states*, good or bad, in a man.

Gen. 26 : 35, "Which were a grief of mind" (ruchu)—or they caused grief—"unto Isaac and to Rebekah." The margin has, "bitterness of spirit." 41 : 8, "His spirit (ruchu) was troubled" his mind was agitated." Deut. 2 : 30, "God hardened his spirit (ruchu) and made his *heart* obstinate." The second clause here explains the first; under God's dealings the Egyptian monarch grew obstinate. Josh. 5 : 1, "neither was there spirit (ruach) in them any more"—they lost heart, or *courage*. Ps. 51 : 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit" (ruach,) i. e. genuine humiliation and contrition. The parallel in the verse is "a broken and a contrite *heart*, O God thou wilt not despise." Prov. 14 : 29, "He that is hasty of spirit (ruach) exalteth folly," i. e. he that is quick-tempered, or irrascible, does this. 17 : 22, "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine, but a broken spirit (ruach) drieth the bones;" i. e. excessive sorrow and care withers and emaciates the frame. 18 : 14, "The spirit (ruach) of a man will sustain his infirmity; but a wounded spirit (ruach) who can bear?" On this verse we shall quote a few words from Dr. Clarke—"a man sustains the ills of his body, and the trials of life, by the strength and energy of his mind. But if the mind be wounded, if this be cast down, if slow consuming care and grief have shot the dagger into the soul, what can then sustain the man? Nothing but the unseen God."

Prov. 25 : 28, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit (ruchu) is like a city that is broken down," i. e. he who does not command his temper. 29 : 11, "a fool uttereth all his mind" (ruach;) i. e., all his thoughts. Ecc. 1 : 14, "all is vanity and vexation of spirit" (ruach) or all produce vanity and vexation. Isa. 19 : 3, "The spirit" (ruach)—the courage—"of Egypt"—or the Egyptians—"shall fail." 61 : 3, "the spirit (ruach) of heaviness;" i. e., great depression and care. Ezek. 3 : 14, "in the heat of my spirit" (ruchi) or in my rage. Compare Judges 8 : 3, below. 20 : 32, "That which cometh into your mind" (rucachem,) meaning that which you think. Habak. 1 : 11, "Then shall his mind (ruach) change"—i. e. his purpose shall change. In a few instances the *ruach* is not translated as in the above passages, but the mental quality it expresses in the particular instances is given in its stead. Thus, Josh. 2 : 11, "Neither did there remain any more courage (ruach) in any man, because of you." Judges 8 : 3, "Then their anger (rucham—margin 'spirit') was abated toward him, when he had said that."

Note.—The process by which *ruach* came to express *mental qualities* or *states*, appears to be the following. The entrance of the *ruach*, the "breath of life," into the lungs causes vitality in the organized being man, or makes him alive, and the different mental phenomena evolved by his brain, or which the being man manifests when alive, receive the designation *ruach*, since it is by the influence of the *ruach* that all his essential functions, physical and mental, are performed. For instance, living men have passions and affections, and these are, in Prov. 25 : 28, quoted above, collectively called a man's *ruch* (same word as ruach,) inasmuch as it is by the constant reception of the *ruach* of life that these are excited and preserved in activity; or, as already stated, the secondary cause *ruach* becomes in these verses the designation of some of its sublimest effects.

4th. In many instances *ruach* translated "spirit" is obviously used like "Soul" and "Heart" to express the idea of *self* or personality. Some verses already quoted really belong to this classification, and for the sake of giving as much clearness as possible to this work, they will just be repeated under this head.

Gen, 41 : 8, "In the morning his spirit was troubled," or, *he* was troubled. Other forms are, Ps. 25 : 17, "The troubles of my *heart* are enlarged. John 12 : 27, "Now is my *soul* troubled;" i. e. now am I troubled. Gen. 45 : 27, "The spirit of Jacob their Father revived. Other forms are, Is. 57 : 15, "To revive the *heart* of the contrite ones;" i. e. to revive the contrite ones. Lam. 1 : 16, "The comforter that should relieve my *soul*," or me. Deut. 2 : 30, "God hardened his spirit" or him. Another form is, Exod. 7 : 13, "and he hardened Pharaoh's *heart*;" or made him obstinate. The opposite state of mind is thus expressed. Ps. 35 : 13, "I humbled my *soul*;" or myself. 1 Kings 21 : 5, "Why is thy spirit so sad?" i. e. why art *thou* so sad? 1 Chron. 5 : 26, "Stirred up the spirit of Pul," or simply stirred up Pul. 2 Chron. 21 : 16, "The spirit of the Philistines," or the Philistines, simply. Job. 7 : 11 "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit," or I will speak in *my* anguish. The parallel to this member immediately follows in the verse,

—"I will complain in the bitterness of my *soul*," or I will complain in my bitterness, 10 : 12, "thy visitation hath preserved my spirit," or *me*. 15 : 13, "turnest thy spirit," or turnest *thyself*, "against God." 32 : 18, "I am full of matter, the spirit within me (margin, 'of my belly,') constraineth me." The second clause is explained in this instance by the first, and the passage simply means, I am full of matter;—I am constrained from within, or I am constrained, i. e. to speak, as he says in verse 20, "I will speak," &c. Ps. 31 : 5, "Into thine hand I commit my spirit," or I commit *myself*, "thou hast redeemed me, O Lord." The "me" in the second clause is parallel to "my spirit" in the first. Ps. 32 : 2, "in whose spirit," in whom, "there is no guile." 51 : 10, "renew a right (margin, "constant") "spirit within me."

A right spirit is a right state of spirit, and a prayer for a right state of spirit is a desire to be made as a man right, or constant in the exercise of religion. The parallel to "spirit" here is "heart" in the first clause of the verse, "create in me a clean heart, O God renew," &c. The whole verse is a prayer from David that God would make him a morally pure and perseveringly religious man.

Ps. 76 : 12, "He shall cut off the spirit of princes," i. e., he shall cut off princes. 77 : 3, "my spirit," or I, "was overwhelmed." The parallel to this clause is in the first part of the verse, "I remembered God and was troubled; I complained and my spirit," &c. 77 : 6, "My spirit," or I, "made diligent search." 106 : 33, "They provoked his (Moses') spirit;" i. e. they provoked *him*. 142 : 3, "When my spirit," or when I "was overwhelmed." 143 : 7, "My spirit faileth," or I fail. Prov. 11 : 13, "He that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter," i. e. a faithful person concealeth the matter. 16 : 2, "The Lord weigheth the spirits," i. e. the Lord weigheth men. The same truth is sometimes expressed by another form, thus—"the Lord searcheth all HEARTS," 1 Chron. 28 : 9. Ecc. 7 : 8, "the patient in spirit" —or *the patient*—"is better than the proud in spirit," or *the proud*. 10 : 4, "If the spirit of the ruler"—i. e, if *the ruler*—"rise up against thee, leave not thy place." Isa. 38 : 16, "In all these things is the life of my spirit," or *of me*; or, In all these things is my life. Gesen. Lex. 54 : 6, "a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit,"—a forsaken and grieved woman. Dan. 2 : 1, wherewith his spirit"—or *he*—"was troubled." 7 : 15, "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body," or, I Daniel was inwardly grieved; or just, I Daniel was grieved. Hag. 1 : 14, "The Lord stirred up the spirit of Zerubbabel"—or simply, Zerubbabel—"the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and the spirit of Joshua," or simply, Joshua. Mal. 2 : 16, "take heed to your spirit," or to *yourselves*. Instead of "spirit" we have "mind" used to express personality in Dan. 5 : 20, "But when his heart"—or when *he*—"was lifted up; and his mind (ruch) hardened in pride," i. e. when *he* was hardened in pride.

Before concluding this section of our work, we may refer briefly to two passages in which *ruach* occurs, as they have sometimes been supposed to look in favor of the prevailing opinion about the human spirit.

1. The first is Job 4 : 15, "Then ('when deep sleep falleth on men,' v. 13) a spirit passed before my face, the hair of my flesh stood up." On which we remark,

a. That, as this forms part, not of Job's words but of a speech by "Eliphaz the Temanite" (v. 1) whom we have no reason to view as an inspired man, his words, whatever they may express, are not to be held as bringing with them divine authority, no more than those of any other uninspired person.

b. But then, when Eliphaz declares he saw in vision "a spirit," he does not say it was a *human* spirit, and who would affirm that "a spirit" and "a *human* spirit" are the same thing?

c. The passage then contains nothing for the common idea about human spirits. That there are creatures called "spirits" in the universe we do not deny; but we assert, on extended scriptural authority, that man is not a spirit, for he is "flesh;" the *ruach* he possesses is only the spirit, or breath, of life from God. No wonder, then, we never read of *disembodied* human spirits in the Book. This language, with its kindred phraseology "deathless spirit of man," "immortal soul," &c., is common almost everywhere but in the Word of God! Even Eliphaz rebukes the idea, when he tells us that the voice he heard inquired, "Shall MORTAL MAN be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker? Behold, he put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly: How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth." Job 4 : 17, 18, 19.

2. Isa. 31 : 3, "Now the Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit (ruach.) When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together" (or be destroyed.)

This passage draws no contrast between flesh, and everything that bears the name of *ruach*; but between the creatures mentioned in it,—"the Egyptians" and "their horses"—and the eternal God who is "a Spirit,"—whose nature is spiritual; who also is possessed of infinite power to aid his friends, and crush his enemies. Man is here represented as frail, for he is no less flesh than horses, "all flesh" being common scriptural designation of the whole terrestrial animal creation. God is a spirit, of unbounded, changeless, resistless energy. "This verse," says Professor Alexander, in his commentary on Isaiah, "repeats the contrast between human and divine aid, and the threatening, that the unbelievers and their foreign helpers should be involved in the same destruction. The antithesis of *flesh* and *spirit*, like that of *God* and *man*, is not metaphysical but rhetorical, and it is intended simply to express extreme dissimilitude or inequality."

[To be Continued.]

Vice stings us even in our pleasures, but virtue consoles us even in our pains.

The just man will flourish in spite of envy.

From A. L.

Br. Storrs.—I favored with the by a good broth myself more close of the cause of t by to be instrum blessing of God, istic utopian pa vainly attempt t comprehends ete inherently immor conditionally and throughout the c with the same br withhold his sus moment we shoul tinctly informs u ished with everla ence of the Lor Does not the Al space? Is he n Can he not with survey the univer when destroyed? bounds of time a rejoice to say the though slowly, he to read and think tant subject. To submitted to the their *human* spiri the Gospel of Ch verted by the ma light that is in u that darkness. against this doctr if men gave unive content to live in their hearts to Go but men are not either by preachin erwise. It is not ings with men to are volunteer su purely a free-will that man would be destiny. Would i of mankind to be a what awaits them thermore, most m some way escape p time, that they wi some would prefer die, *i. e.*, be destro set before us by th one contrasted with it something tang through Christ, is to Christian effort— in the new Jerusale

By taking this v vexed questions are the old Pagan noti contradictory in ma reason and common ed away, and I can

From A. L. Hunt, Carbondale City, Pa.

Br. Storrs.—For some time past I have been favored with the perusal of your invaluable paper, by a good brother here, but wishing to identify myself more closely with the friends and advocates of the cause of truth, and the Bible, hoping thereby to be instrumental in doing something, by the blessing of God, towards overthrowing the Babelistic utopian paradrome, by which theologians vainly attempt to span the period of time which comprehends eternity, by assuming that man is inherently immortal—that the creature man is unconditionally and unqualifiedly destined to live on throughout the countless ages of eternity, although with the same breath they aver, that if God should withhold his sustaining hand for a moment, that moment we should be annihilated. The Book distinctly informs us that the wicked will "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." Does not the Almighty pervade the immensity of space? Is he not an everywhere present God? Can he not with one glance of his eye, so to speak, survey the universe? Where then are the wicked when destroyed? Why, doubtless, "beyond the bounds of time and space." That is—nowhere. I rejoice to say the cause of truth is advancing, although slowly, here. Men are beginning to dare to read and think for themselves on this all-important subject. Too long already have men blindly submitted to the supposed infallible teachings of their *human* spiritual advisers. Some features of the Gospel of Christ are in danger of being subverted by the manifold traditions of men. If the light that is in us become darkness, how great is that darkness. The principle objection urged against this doctrine by immortal soulists is, that if men gave universal credence to it, they will be content to live in sin, and never repent and give their hearts to God. This looks a little plausible, but men are not driven into Heaven by fright, either by preaching the terrors of the law or otherwise. It is not in accordance with God's dealings with men to coerce obedience. His subjects are volunteer subjects. His worship must be purely a free-will worship. The objector says, that man would be less concerned about his future destiny. Would it be possible for the generality of mankind to be apparently less concerned about what awaits them in the future than now? Furthermore, most men suppose that they shall in some way escape punishment, or if punished for a time, that they will eventually be restored; and some would prefer to live in misery rather than die, *i. e.*, be destroyed. Here life and death are set before us by the great head of the church: the one contrasted with the other, and in opposition to it something tangible, zeal-inspiring. Life, life through Christ, is the heaven-appointed stimulus to Christian effort—a life of happiness unspeakable in the new Jerusalem, at his second coming.

By taking this view of the subject, a hundred vexed questions are immediately solved; whereas, the old Pagan notion rendered the interpretation contradictory in many instances, besides outraging reason and common sense. Now the mist is cleared away, and I can read the Bible understandingly, without the aid of a commentary and the traditions of the Fathers. Now, God appears as He is represented in his word, a God of love, mercy, and justice; who willeth not the death of any, but rather that all would come unto him that they might have life.

The objector says, he would throw away the Bible entirely, ere he would believe in man's mortality. Yes, throw away the holy Book of God in a rage, rather than give up the Popish notion of inherent immortality. Strange, indeed, must be their views of the attributes of the Creator. If it is God's will, and he declares it is, that the wicked shall be destroyed, ought we not rather to rejoice at it? If our hope of life and happiness is based on native immortality, as many suppose, then with the apostle, we are of all men most miserable. Then Christ died and rose again, in a great measure, in vain; for the resurrection in that case is of minor importance, and a secondary consideration. Is it a virtue in man to delight in the sufferings of a fellow-creature, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; especially when no benefit is derived to him or his fellow? How delightful and transporting the sight, from the Eden of bliss, to behold near and dear friends, a beloved father or mother, or peradventure a brother or sister, wailing in woe unutterable, without hope of mercy, and without end! And how much more entrancing, to view a husband or wife, son or daughter, vainly calling for help, and with outstretched arms imploring your aid!

From Jesse Broderick, St. Catherines, C. W.

Dear Friend:—Some months ago, your Six Sermons fell into my hands rather in a singular way. One of the clerks where I was at work was sweeping out the store. Amongst the leaves and papers I saw one with these words on the cover, "Are the Wicked Immortal?" Instead of throwing *it* in the stove along with the rest, I thought I would give it a reading. Accordingly I took it home, but it lay for some time before I read it, thinking it might not be well to spend my time on Sunday reading such a book as that. However, I am thankful that at last I spent time on a *Monday;* and from that day, neither Sunday nor any other day passed away, for some time, without spending a portion thereof in reading that valuable book; and, as M. Bachelor says, they (the Six Sermons,) have opened the eyes of thousands. I thank the good Lord that I am *one* of the number led to see that man is *mortal;* and an unholy mortal; and that Immortality can only be found in Christ.

A few week since, I had two numbers of the "Bible Examiner," for the month of May last, put into my hands, and from what I have read therein, I feel desirous to become a subscriber, and I enclose one dollar for payment, in advance. In case you should issue the Examiner weekly, I shall be glad to pay whatever more may be required.

Yours, in hope of immortality through Christ.

"The Discussion."—Owing to sickness in Prof. Mattison's family, he has not been able to furnish an article for this number of the Examiner.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY 15, 1854.

"Going to Heaven at Death."

The *Louisville Journal* gives the following account of a transaction which occurred ten miles from that city. The lad spoken of was thirteen years old. His name was Henry Merriman. The Journal says:

"This is one of the most mysterious as well as one of the most extraordinary cases of suicide ever committed in this country. Henry was a devout Christian. He had lost a little sister who belonged to the church. This sister had given him a prayer-book on her death-bed, and desired him to use it. He had become so interested in the book, and on the subject of meeting with a dear sister, that it was a subject of daily conversation and prayer with him. He appeared desirous to be with her. His mother had told him that he would meet his sister in heaven after death. He prayed nightly and daily to see her, and in his fit of religious insanity, he, upon his knees, cut his throat from ear to ear, severing both jugular veins. This was truly a sorry sight to look upon—a heart-broken mother, afflicted father, and distressed relatives—this was a scene to dissolve a heart of stone. Every one present was in tears; every man became as it were a child. The verdict of the jury was, that the child came to his death from the influence of the above facts, causing religious insanity."

The child was, no doubt, "insane;" but his desire to be with his sister in heaven—where his "mother told him he would meet her after death"—was perfectly natural from the love he had to her; and no wonder, with such instruction as he had, from the common theology, he should be anxious to go to her loved society; and as "insanity" can be plead for the suicidal act, why stands his mother there "heart-broken," and his father "afflicted?" Had not Henry and his sister met in that glorious heaven where his mother had told him they would meet after death? Why then is she heart-broken? Tell us, ye Philosophers, ye Divines! Summons all the priests of natural immortality, and of going to heaven at death, and before the resurrection at the last day, and see if you can all solve the mystery that a mother, full in your views, stands heart-broken that her two loved and loving ones were now enjoying their happy meeting in heaven!

Seriously—Had such a case of suicide occurred, which could as distinctly have been traced to the influence of the doctrine of no eternal life except through Jesus Christ, and by a resurrection at the last day, would not our theological opponents have shouted—"Behold the fruit of your doctrine!—that's just what might have been expected!" However, we judge not the tendency of the common theory by an isolated case like that before us. We believe the notion of going to heaven at death is clearly subversive of the whole gospel scheme of redemption, is a practical denial of the resurrection of the dead, and the return of the Son of God "*from* heaven;" and is just as truly a fable as the Roman purgatory, and quite as pernicious in its effects. Saith Paul—"Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God; and to wait for His Son *from heaven*, whom He raised from the dead," &c. 1 Thes. 1: 9, 10. The true Christian is here characterised not as waiting to "*go* to heaven," but waiting for Christ to come *from* heaven, when the "Lord himself shall decend from heaven with a shout, and with the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ shall rise." See 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.

The Bible hope—the gospel hope—is entirely a different matter from the fancy hope so pathetically urged upon our attention by the advocates of "going to heaven at death." Let these things be pondered well; and let us all see that our hope has for its foundation the words of God and not the words of man.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

Under the above head the "Rev. D. W. Clark, D.D.," of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is writing for the *Christian Advocate* of this city. Some of his statements and remarks we shall notice. He opens by saying:

"Job, speaking of the place of the dead, calls it 'a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is darkness.'"

From this starting point, Mr. Clark proceeds to speak as follows:

"In the early ages of the world, and even now in some heathen lands, the place of the dead is conceived of as a dark, indistinct, and dreamy region, situated somewhere beneath the earth. This was the first expression of the instinctive longing of the soul after immortality—the first rational or natural denial of the extinction of our being in death. It was natural that in the infantile state in which the human mind existed in the early ages of the world, that this childish conception should spring into existence, and exert a controlling influence over the imaginations of men. Their friends died, and their bodies were deposited in subterranean vaults and caves; hence arose the idea of the dark, underground region where they were supposed to live. This region was called among the Hebrews *Sheol*, and among the Greeks *Hades*—which terms mean a place of darkness, where nothing is seen, or, specifically, the place of departed spirits. In this land

of darkness and silence the dead retained their living personality in the form of mysterious shadows, and hence, were called *manes*, or shades. This land of shadows was to them desirable, because they expected there to meet again their departed friends, and to enjoy their companionship for ever. This was the dawning twilight of the glorious doctrine of the soul's immortality, now so clearly defined and so fully demonstrated."

Here we have the origin of the doctrine of the soul's immortality distinctly stated by an orthodox minister, "D.D." It is *heathenism*, or heathenish in its birth. The Doctor however affirms, in that "land of darkness and silence the dead retained their living personality," and "this land of shadows was to them desirable, because they expected there to meet again their departed friends," &c. A curious meeting that in darkness, "where nothing is seen." How "desirable" such a place must be! Again the doctor says:

"An offshoot, as it were, of this early conception of the state of the departed spirits has traveled down and been manifested in some instances in our own time. We refer to the idea that the spirits of the dead linger about the places where their bodies were buried. * * * Dr Knapp says 'that many of the ancients believed that the departed souls remain in or about the graves or dwellings of the dead, either for ever or for a long time.' He also says that the opinion widely prevailed that departed spirits sometimes return from the kingdom of the dead, and linger aronnd the dead body or the place of burial. These ideas also prevailed, to some extent, among the Jews and early Christians; and thus it was forbidden, in the year 313, to kindle a light in the places of burial, lest the spirits of the saints should be disturbed."

Thus heathenism corrupted the Jews and Christians away from the simplicity of the Bible doctrine of a future life by a *resurrection* from the dead. It is a great pity that some one could not "kindle a light" that should not only "disturb" the heathen fable but drive the ghostly doctrine of life when dead from the minds of men, that they might see and feel the importance of the resurrection at the last day. The Doctor next says:

"A similar feeling still exists among the less intelligent people even in Christian countries. Hence the half-defined, the half-believed idea of the ghost of the murdered man or of the suicide haunting the place where the crime was perpetrated. Hence also that feeling when we approach the place where the bodies of our departed friends slumber as though they themselves were there. 'Hence it is common for persons, of all grades of cultivation, to seek beneath the willow where they lie a kind of lonely fellowship with their beloved dead. There is a sweet hope, at least, that there they are nearer to them than in all the world besides; and he is regarded as a cold and heartless intruder who would argue away from them the cherished dream. 'She goeth to the grave to weep there.' Sweet mourner! Though we would not rudely drive her away from the spot which has embalmed all she held dear on earth, or forbid her to water with her tears, the earth which she expects will some day yield her back her own again, yet we would whisper softly and tenderly, 'He is not here. Why seek ye the living among the dead?'"

The most remarkable part of the preceeding extract is, that the "Rev. D.D." should give countenance to such a perverson of Scripture. To prove that the dead are not dead, or that their spirits are alive, the words of the angel at the tomb of Jesus are garbled. Why did the angel say, "*He is not here?*" and why did he seem to upbraid them with the question, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" The Doctor seems to wish to make the impression that this language is appropriate to use to all persons who think their friends are dead because they are laid in the grave.

Let us look at the facts withheld by Mr. Clark. What are they? Jesus was dead—for "*Christ died*—and *he was buried*," so saith the Scriptures; and not till "the *third day*" did he *live* again, and then he "*rose from the dead:*" now he is alive for ever more. When the angel said, "He is not here," he spoke truth, because Jesus had arisen from the dead. But would it have been truth if he had spoken in this manner the day previous? Certainly not: it would have been untrue. Jesus, before his resurrection was "among the dead."—Such is the testimony of the Bible; and to say the contrary is to be "infidel." The question of the angel to the woman at the sepulchre shows the fact beyond reasonable controversy, that had it not been for Christ's resurrection, he would still have been "among the dead;" and that consequently without a resurrection men remain among the dead, and are *not* among the living. A most fatal text this for the learned divine who garbled it to make it speak in favor of the heathen offspring, the "soul's immortality."

And then, who should his garbled extract have been "whispered softly" to? Only think, gentle reader, to Mary, the sister of Lazarus! for, "She goeth unto the grave to weep there." She however met Jesus, and said to him, "If thou hadst been here my brother had not died." She is on her way to the grave, is she, Doctor, to weep there over Lazarus? "Sweet mourner!" Why did not Jesus "whisper softly and tenderly" to mourning Mary and Martha, and say of Lazarus, "He is not here. Why seek ye the living among the dead?" What *soft* words these would have been! How consoling, but for the fact that they would have

been words of *falsehood!* Lazarus *was there;* and he was "among the dead." Jesus comforted these sisters with the only true words of comfort concerning "meeting again" those who had died in Christ—"Thy brother shall rise again:" *not*, "Thy brother has gone to heaven—he is alive:" No, such words would have been words palpably false. "Lazarus *is dead*," said Jesus to his disciples, and when he cried, "Lazarus *come forth*," he did not "whisper softly—'*He is not here*, why seek ye the living among the dead?'" No; he really seemed to think Lazarus was there! and he spoke accordingly! and, strange to tell, "*he* that *was dead* came forth, bound hand and foot with *grave clothes*!" etc.

This whole transaction, together with the events at Jesus' own tomb, stamp for ever the whole fable, of a conscious entity surviving in death, as an enormous error. Are not the abettors of such an error the *real* "infidels?" They have substituted the traditions of men for the truth of God, and virtually deny the "resurrection of the dead"—the great cardinal doctrine of revelation. The Scriptures are garbled by them; the context, and the general teachings of the Bible are set at naught to sustain their theory of the "soul's immortality."

Mr. Clark proceeds as follows:

"While we cherish the spot where the dear departed lie as something sacred and holy in the heart's affections, and though we often go there to commune in our thoughts and feelings with them, yet it is well to dislodge from our minds so gloomy a thought as that their spirits are evermore hovering around the sad, mournful spot. Ah, who could cherish such an idea without a sensible augmentation of sorrow and of deep concern? The place is so cold and lonely. The night winds sigh so dolefully there. How dreadful, in the dead of night, is that dreary and dreamless silence! The snow lies so cold upon the grave; and fiercer than even the cutting anguish of your bereaved heart are the wintry storms that rave, and drift, and whirl around the monumental marble. Can any one, then wish the sainted dead to be there? No, no. We would not *wish* them to be there. They are *not* there; it is only inanimate mortality. It feels not its loneliness, and is not chilled by the coldness of the place. Banish, then, the thought from your mind; for they are not there. In happier society than that in the city of the dead they live; to sweeter sounds they listen; to the music of angelic choirs they bend an enraptured ear. In genial and stormless climes they have found a home."

This is such *poetry* that we feel almost inclined to pass it in silence. It is true the "spirits" of the dead are not "hovering around the sad, mournful spot"—the grave. That would be "mournful" indeed! No wonder such a thought is "dreadful"—dreadful to think the spirits are where "the snow lies so cold upon the grave!" and then, for them to stay out there "in the dead of night!"—and through "the wintry storms that rave, and drift, and whirl around the monumental marble!" Surely, "we would not wish for them to be there," for it must be fearful to think what those "immaterial immortals" must suffer from such "wintry storms!" What a penetrating *material* these storms must be charged with to make the *immaterials* feel that such a place is "dreadful!"—They are *not* there," cries out the Doctor. Truly, for once, he is right; but where are they, Br. C? He answers—"In happier society * * * to sweeter sounds they listen; to the music of angel choirs they bend an enraptured ear," &c. Here is enough of untruth, and we are glad he did not add, "They are praising the Lord," for that would be so palpable a falsehood that no mask could cover it: because the divine Spirit of God hath declared, by the mouth of the prophet, "*The dead praise not the Lord*, neither any that go down to *silence*." Psa. 115: 17.

Mr. Clark next gives us some account of the doctrine of the "transmigration of souls," traveling through various bodies of animals, beasts, birds and fishes, till they reach the "pure world of blessed spirits." Possibly he had Pres. Beecher's "*Conflict of Ages*" in his mind; but he calls this doctrine a "Dark and gloomy speculation," yet he admits it was "prevalent in the theology of the ancient Egyptians, in the philosophy of Pythagoras and of Plato, and has found advocates in nearly every age." So it must be true, if the advocates of the soul's immortality are correct in arguing the truth of their theory by telling us, "it must be true that the soul is immortal, because all nations have believed it so;" and Plato has especially been appealed to in proof of the truth of their theory. Let them take the whole dose which Plato and his brother Philosophers have mixed for them, and not shrink from it because its dregs are bitter. We boldly assert the darling doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul has no higher origin than heathen philosophy: not one word of it in the Bible. Mr. Clark next speaks at follows:

"As science advanced and knowledge increased the old theory of an under-world region, where the dead were gathered, gave place to the more distinct theory of an *intermediate abode*. The poet thus describes this separate, intermediate abode:—

"O see! an awful world is this
Where spirits are detain'd. 'Tis half a heaven
And half a hell! What horrid mixture here!
I see before me, and along the edge
Of rayless night, on either side the shades
Of spirits move; as yet unjudged, undoom'd,

Or unrewarded. Some do seem to hope ;
Some sit in gloom ; some walk in dark suspense ;
Some agonize to change their state. O, say,
Is all this real, or but a monstrous dream ?"

Having received the first indication of this doctrine from heathen philosophy, it was subsequently evolved in Christian light. It first became a part of Christian philosophy, and then a part of Christian faith. The Council of Florence, in 1439, established it as a doctrine of the Papal Church, and it was afterward reaffirmed by the Council of Trent. It is also recognised in the forms of the Episcopal Church. In the Papal Church this intermediate abode is connected with the idea of purgatory and the extension of man's probation to this middle abode. This privilege, however, does not extend to those who have not believed and been baptized into the Church ; for all such, they believe, go immediately and without hope to hell. In the Episcopal Church this intermediate abode is regarded as a place where the spirit is detained till the resurrection of the body and its final glorification ; and for these events they believe it to be undergoing a preparatory training while in its separate abode.

The special and insurmountable objections to this theory of an intermediate abode will more distinctly appear in our subsequent discussion ; but we cannot fail here to remark, that, so far as it is connected with the idea of probation subsequent to this life, it is palpably opposed to the clearest teachings of divine revelation.

Here again Mr. Clark gives us a pretty fair account of the origin of the intermediate conscious state of the dead ; and "the Poet's" description differs nothing essentially from the "orthodox" account of the same state; but he objects to the Papal part of the conscious state of the *dead-alive* ones.

We come at last to the hated doctrine Mr. Clark has evidently been seeking to approach, and he pounces upon it as follows :

"Another error relating to the intermediate state, and one that is more revolting to all the instincts of our nature than any of those we have considered, is that THE SOUL DIES WITH THE BODY. IT IS STRANGE THAT SUCH A DOCTRINE SHOULD EVER HAVE FOUND PLACE WITH THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN THE RESURRECTION AND IN EVERLASTING LIFE AFTER DEATH. Yet such is actually the case. This theory is thus stated by some of its modern advocates : 'The whole man, whatever are his component parts, suffers privation of life, in what we call death.' And again, 'The period which elapses between the time of death and the resurrection is spent in unconsciousness and inactivity ; the soul is either extinct or in a profound and dreamless sleep, forgetful of all that is past, ignorant of all that is around it, and regardless of all that is to come.' The philosophical basis of this doctrine is the assumption that the soul is only the result of the physical organization, and, therefore, can have no separate existence. But all reason and all philosophy demonstrate the falseness of this assumption. The premises being taken away, the conclusion is of no force. THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT IS ABSURD AND UNSUSTAINED. THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE BIBLE TEACHES SUCH A DOCTRINE IS A MONSTROUS FRAUD UPON ALL REVELATION.—Quickened and revived as this doctrine has been repeatedly amid the delusions and heresies of the present day, it has so little to give it countenance, either in reason or revelation, and is in itself so repugnant to all the instincts of the soul, that no degree of fanaticism can give to it more than a brief and sickly existence. A sufficient refutation of the assumption will be found in the Scripture doctrines we shall develop in the subsequent discussion of this subject. But we may inquire here, How can this state of unconscious sleep or of ABSOLUTE extinction be consistent with the living union of the believer in Christ? 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' This is the great pledge of our uninterrupted life. He that believeth hath eternal life ; he that liveth and believeth on Him shall never die ; and he that hath the Son hath life.—CHRIST IS THE SOURCE OF OUR LIFE ; AND AS THE SOUCE CANNOT BECOME EXTINCT, NEITHER CAN THE LIFE THAT FLOWS FROM IT. DEATH HAS NO POWER HERE. Instead of locking our faculties up in unconsciousness, and isolating us from our union with Christ, it can only break down some of the obstructions to that intercourse that have heretofore existed.

'It gives us more than was in Eden lost.'"

We have put in small caps those parts of the foregoing to which we wished to call special attention. If the *soul* does not "die with the body" then it can have no resurrection ; hence on Mr. Clark's theory there is no resurrection of *the man*, because the resurrection is of "*the dead*." "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" "But some will say, How are *the dead* raised up? and with *what body* do THEY come?" 1 Cor. I5 : 12, 35. "*They*" is spoken of the dead. If the soul is not dead it shares not in the resurrection, and the body only is the subject of it : and Paul saith—"Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die : and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that *body* that shall be, but bare grain" [i. e., *mere* grain] "it may chance of wheat or some other : but God giveth it *a body* as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." Here the apostle seems to affirm, that the body given the resurrection dead is *not* the identical one that was sown ; but the resurrection *man* must be the identical or it is no resurrection but an entire new creation : hence it follows that whatever constituted the essential man was dead. Whatever the soul may be, therefore, it was dead and is the proper resurrection subject. We give here the Para-

phrase of John Locke, Esq., on Paul's words, 1 Cor. 15 : 36–38.

"Thou fool! does not daily experience teach thee, that the seed which thou sowest corrupts and dies, before it springs up and lives again? that which thou sowest is the bare grain of wheat, or barley, or the like; but the body which it has, when it rises up is different from the seed that is sown. For it is not the seed that rises up again, but quite a different body, such as God has thought fit to give it, viz., a plant of a particular shape and size, which God has appointed to each sort of seed."

We pass this paraphrase without endorsing it, but leaving it to its own weight. But if the body only dies, the body only can be the subject of resurrection, and it must be identical or it is no resurrection. We believe the same particles of matter may enter into the body with which the dead come in the resurrection or they may not.—We regard that point as entirely unessential; but the same identical *man* who died must be the subject of the resurrection; and whatever constitutes his identity must therefore have been dead. And "it is strange that such a doctrine" as the denial of the death of the man proper "should ever have found place with those who" profess "to believe in the resurrection, and in everlasting life," *not* "after death," but after the resurrection at the last day.

Mr. Clark says—"The scriptural argument," to sustain the unconscious state of the dead, "is absurd and unsustained." That is, of course, in his mind: but whether it is so in *fact* we may possibly see before we have done with our review of him. He adds—"The assumption that the Bible teaches such a doctrine is a monstrous fraud upon all revelation." We reply—The doctrine that "THOU *shalt not surely die*" appears to be the great "*fraud*;" and if age can make it true it is as old as could be desired. What side of that controversy our friend Clark has adopted is quite apparent, and will doubtless be still more so before long. He talks of the view we advocate being that of the "*absolute* extinction" of man in death, even "of the believer in Christ." We will not say, Br. C. is guilty of "a monstrous fraud" in this insinuation; but we will say, he is sadly mistaken in our views. "The dead in Christ" are "*asleep*;" hence are unconscious. What that state of sleep is, except that it is one of "*no knowledge*," we do not pretend to say; but it is not one of "*absolute* extinction:" they will awake at the voice of Christ—"at the last day"—as did Lazarus at Bethany, when he was dead and Christ called him forth. He "had been dead," saith the record; but Jesus said, "I go that I may *awake him* out of his sleep," and he did awake him; and he will awake all his followers when he shall "himself descend from heaven, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ shall rise;" and our friend C. will find it difficult to produce a promise of Christ, because "I live ye shall live also," that embraces any period "after death" till "*the last day*" resurrection.

In the sentiment that "Christ is our life" we heartily concur; therefore the life principle is not of ourselves: "the source" is in Christ, who is alive for evermore. "Death has no power" to deprive the believer of this life, though such believer sleep in utter unconsciousness one year, or a thousand: he will surely awake at the voice of Christ: but as to substituting the sentiment—"Death gives us more than was in Eden lost"—for the promise of Christ—"*I* will raise *him* up at the last day"—we wish not to share in such blasphemy.

Our friend Clark says, the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, till the resurrection—or, "that the soul dies with the body"—"is more revolting to all the instincts of our nature than any of those errors" he had previously "considered." Now, his "instincts" must be of a very peculiar character; for he had "considered" purgatory, transmigration through beasts, birds, and fishes—the dancing of the soul in bleak winter storms and dark nights over the grave of its dead body, &c.; yet none of these are so "revolting" as the thought of sleeping quietly and soundly till Jesus shall return from heaven to awake us!! Really, we think there are not many "instincts" like our friend Clark's; and we rather *guess* if he was certain he should have to try the beauties of purgatory, transmigration, and dancing in the dark wintry storms about the grave yard, he might think better of a little quiet sleep till Jesus should bid him wake. At any rate, *our* instinct differs entirely from our good brother Clark's: and we doubt not, when he awakes in the resurrection, with all the rest of Christ's family, who slumbered peacefully while so many of earth's storms and trials were howling around its inhabitants, he will rejoice to find he has not to wait for one of the glorious family of Christ to end his trials before enjoying their society.

Honor that which is good, just, and virtuous, in all men, let their form of worship, or outward manner of expression about religion be what it may. To set down mistakes of the head for corruptions of the heart is a great folly.

IS THE SOUL A DIST

Affirmative by C.

DEAR EXAMINER:—My la
a discussion of Eccl. 12 : 7.
the list of passages I have off
Isaiah 10 : 18. In this
men of the Assyrian army
mighty trees of a forest. B
of their complete destruction,
named as well as the body.
"shall consume the glory of
fruitful field, both soul and
the soul even to the flesh."
natural, in such a connection
ming the *life*, or the *breath*,
idea plainly suggested is that
with the body, not as an attri
makes the man. The bearin
the chronology of the second
and hope to consider the poi
In Dan. 12 : 2, the dead a
ing from sleep. This certain
from non-entity. If now it is
tical bodies of the dead are r
culties of that theory are i
urged that bodies of identical o
again, I grant that is possible
would not be spiritual bodies
ings be accountable for any d
former bodies, however precis
be. In short, if the *soul* has
per identity of the dying and
possible. And *because* the so
"sleep," so often used in s
christians, is pertinent and sig
Matt. 10 : 28. This passa
in Isa. 10 : 18, but much mo
"Fear not them which kill t
able to kill the soul." But n
stroy the soul if it depends o
istence. If it is not a distinc
surviving the body's dissolutio
slayer does what is here dec
man. God may re-create the
(?) from temporary non-existe
have it so. For argument's s
grant even that. But even
when the soul has been pro
stroyed. The re-creation of t
instead of *disproving* that it h
The whole verse indicates t
is but partial. It affects t
second death is utter and com
vives the first death, either by
or by some equivalent law whi
stand. It is unhurt of the
through grace, by the life-givi
Matt. 17 : 4. Respecting
Moses and Elias with Christ, i
that the "vision" was real and
seeming. Now, though Elias
quite certain that Moses was n
6, and Jude v : 9. And that
ted the resurrection is without
If then his body was not here,
that his soul had, and has, a
and he was now permitted to "

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Affirmative by C. F. Hudson.

DEAR EXAMINER:—My last letter closed with a discussion of Eccl. 12 : 7. I now proceed with the list of passages I have offered.

Isaiah 10 : 18. In this prophecy the valiant men of the Assyrian army are compared to the mighty trees of a forest. But to express the idea of their complete destruction, the soul (nephesh) is named as well as the body. The Light of Israel "shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body," (Heb.) "from the soul even to the flesh." Now it would be unnatural, in such a connection, to speak of *consuming* the *life*, or the *breath*, or the *blood*. The idea plainly suggested is that the soul combined with the body, not as an attribute, but as an entity, makes the man. The bearing of this passage on the chronology of the second death I do not forget, and hope to consider the point in due time.

In Dan. 12 : 2, the dead are spoken of as awaking from sleep. This certainly is not a re-existing from non-entity. If now it is urged that the identical bodies of the dead are raised again, the difficulties of that theory are insuperable. If it is urged that bodies of identical *organization* are raised again, I grant that is possible. But such bodies would not be spiritual bodies; nor could such beings be accountable for any deeds done in certain former bodies, however precisely like they might be. In short, if the *soul* has not survived, all proper identity of the dying and the rising man is impossible. And *because* the soul survives the word "sleep," so often used in speaking of deceased christians, is pertinent and significant.

Matt. 10 : 28. This passage is similar to that in Isa. 10 : 18, but much more clear and decisive. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." But men can kill and destroy the soul if it depends on the body for its existence. If it is not a distinct entity, capable of surviving the body's dissolution, then every man-slayer does what is here declared impossible for man. God may re-create the soul, and restore it (?) from temporary non-existence, if Br. Grew will have it so. For argument's sake I am ready to grant even that. But even that could only be, when the soul has been properly killed and destroyed. The re-creation of the soul must *assume*, instead of *disproving* that it had been destroyed.

The whole verse indicates that the first death is but partial. It affects the body only. The second death is utter and complete. The soul survives the first death, either by the law of its nature or by some equivalent law which we do not understand. It is unhurt of the second death, only through grace, by the life-giving spirit.

Matt. 17 : 4. Respecting this appearance of Moses and Elias with Christ, it must be granted that the "vision" was real and not a dream, or a seeming. Now, though Elias was translated, it is quite certain that Moses was not. See Deut. 34 : 6, and Jude v : 9. And that Moses has anticipated the resurrection is without shadow of proof. If then his body was not here, we can only infer that his soul had, and has, a separate existence, and he was now permitted to "appear" with Elias and Christ. If it be argued that the whole was a vision of things yet future, that objection may be met by my remark on the next passage.

Matt. 22 : 32. Is God *now* the God of Abraham? If so, and Abraham in no way survives his body, then God is *now*, at least, the God of the dead; the very thing which Christ denied.

Luke 16 : 22. I cite this passage, not because I wish to rest my argument on a parable or allegory, but to show that whatever be the *meaning* and *application* of it, its scenery reminds the reader most naturally of a proper intermediate state.

That the story of the rich man and Lazarus is found in the Talmud, and represents some gentile nations, is all very true. Just how much of its teachings Christ intended to indorse, I need not now decide. But if I had not believed before that the use of the word *hades* means something, I should suspect so upon reading Br. Storrs' gloss to the effect that *hades* means the grave. "In *the grave* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments?" (Miscellany, Rich Man and Lazarus, p. 1, 2.) Will such exegesis solve the difficulties of the passage? But Br. S. says again (p. 6) that Theophylact, an ancient writer, first applies this parable to the concerns of the next life, and then allegorizes it. Theophylact belongs to the 11th century. Nearly 800 years before it had been applied, not only by Origen, but by Enethodius, the most prominent anti-Origenist, to the concerns of the next state of man. And even Irenæus, martyred in the hope of Life in Christ, in A. D. 202, understood this passage as something more than allegory. He says (Lib. ii cap. lxii.) "Our Lord hath most plainly taught us that our souls not only continue after death, while passing out of one body into another, but also that they keep the character of the body, wherein they are then also adapted, the same which they had before; as likewise, that they remember the actions and omissions of their life past; in that enarration which is written concerning the rich man and Lazarus, who was refreshed in Abraham's bosom." Thus speaks the disciple of Polycarp, and one who held the righteous alone to be immortal.

Again I say, I do not wish, and trust I do not need, to rest any argument on this account of the rich man and Lazarus. How much it fairly proves respecting the state of the soul I do not know. That the received doctrine makes too much of it, is certain. But on the other hand it is not so easily disposed of as mere allegory. For how could the history of the Jews and Gentiles be allegorized by a scene in *hades*, if *hades* is only the abode of dust? Again, the poet Shelley loved to illustrate things physical by things intellectual; the clearer by the more obscure. Now were the Jews so transcendentalized that myths of their theology were, in Christ's mouth, mere illustrative parables of their future history?

Acts 7 : 59. How could Stephen pray, "Lord receive my spirit," if, upon expiring, he became altogether dust? The distinction between *psuche* and *pneuma*, however, which has its subordinate importance in this discussion, will be afterwards treated. Yours in the love of Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs :—I pray for divine grace to review, with a single eye to truth, the passages of the sacred volume our brother Hudson has adduced to prove that "the soul that sinneth shall (*not*) die," (in the proper sense of that term,) with the body, being a distinct living entity therefrom.

Isa. 10 : 18. It is not a little remarkable that a passage which so fully and so clearly represents an entire destruction both of soul and body (if the reference is to the men of the army) should be adduced to prove the pre-eminent survivance of the former. As utter destruction of the man is the truth presented, why should it be thought "unnatural in such a connection to speak of consuming the life," &c.? It appears perfectly consistent. It may appear otherwise to one who assumes that the soul is a distinct and deathless entity; but this is the very question at issue, and remains to be proved. The term "soul and body" in the passage no more implies that the former is a distinct entity from the body, than the term "spirit and soul and body," 1 Thess. 5 : 23, implies that man has *two* distinct entities besides his body. All combined constitute but one living entity.

Dan. 12 : 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," &c. Br. H. says, "This certainly is not a re-existing from non-entity. The question is, Is it, or is it not, a re-vivification from a state of unconsciousness? Mark, the entire reference is to that which slept "*in the dust.*" Certainly that which *slept in the dust* was *dead*; so that no proof can be drawn from the term "sleep" in favor of any distinct entity that did not die. Not a syllable of intimation is given in the passage that the awaking is to be effected by any re-union of such a distinct entity with the body. This is to be effected by the voice of the archangel. The *modus* of the resurrection, on any theory, transcends our finite comprehension. The divine testimony is simple on the glorious subject, involving no contradiction. It is, that MAN dies (and not some inferior part of man) and that God raises him (i. e. *man*) from the dead. It is perfectly competent for the Almighty to re-animate the sleeping dust, to give it a perfect organism, identical, in respect to all the powers of thought, memory, and affection, *so far as is necessary to accountability for deeds done in the present state.* Are we to deny the positive testimony of the Eternal Spirit, that all these mental powers perish with the bodily functions in the hour of death, Eccles. 9 : 5, 6, 10; Ps. 146 : 4; 6 : 5; 115 : 17; Job 10 : 18, 19; because we cannot solve all difficulties concerning personal identity? All known philosophical and material facts are opposed to the popular theory. These facts identify mental operations with the brain. A man's brain is diseased. Has he any consciousness of any distinct entity which is independent of and unaffected by the physical disorganization? So far from it, every such disorganization of magnitude, is always connected with mental derangement. The brain, on recovery, is not strictly identically the same. Yet the man's memory recognizes those things, the knowledge of which he had entirely lost for a time. The restoration of physical and mental powers, subsequent both to disease and death, will be amply sufficient to constitute that kind of identity which is essential to accountability. This is all the identity which is essential to accountability. This is all the indentity we intend or need to prove. If man's mental powers are independent of a *dead* brain, as Br. H. supposes, must they not be independent of a *diseased* brain? The contrary, however, is the fact.

Matt. 10 : 28. Certainly this passage, *abstractly considered*, appears to teach that man possesses something which can survive the body. But what shall we say when we find not *one* only, but *several* passages, which as plainly declare that man *can* destroy, and, *in fact*, has destroyed the soul. See Josh. 10 : 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39. He must reconcile them by considering that man can destroy the soul *in one sense*, but *not in another*. Thus we reconcile the apparent opposite declarations, God tempteth no man, and God tempted Abraham. The true rendering of the passage, I suppose, would be, "not able to kill the *life*," which gives no support to the supposition that man possesses any distinct entity from his material organism. Man can destroy the soul or life *temporarily*, but not *eternally*. If this is not the precise meaning of our Lord's words, we must allow an import, consistent with the numerous divine testimonies, previously adduced, that the *entire* man is subject to death, and that, in that hour, all his mental as well as physical powers perish.

Matt. 17 : 4. What is the representation here? Is it that the *disembodied spirit* of Moses appeared? No. It was a *bodily form* which the disciples saw and recognized as Moses. Our friend writes, "If then his body was not here, we can only infer that his soul had, and has a separate existence," &c. Now this miraculous vision must be understood as a literal reality or not. If the former, his body *was* there, and seen by the disci-

ples. If the latter, it aff
to the question at issue.
than a "shadow of proo
Moses, against which, I
tion.

Matt. 22 : 32. Our l
genious, but it is fallaci
in overlooking the true
There is not the least ref
of the patriarchs, except
Whether or not they w
the question of the Sadd
death terminated human
of the resurrection was th
eration. To this, and t
swer and reasoning pe
"As touching THE RESU
have ye not read that wh
by God, saying, I am th
the God of Isaac, and th
not the God of the dead
is the argument here of
that the patriarchs must
that God may be the God
The argument of the fait
must be raised from the d
God of the dead. Now
patriarchs were existing
seems to suppose, God w
living, if there is no resur
by our brother's plausib
force of our Savior's argu
fied. The passage, so far
ular opinion, manifestly s
may ask, is it not a matt
the sentiment we advocat
least, the God of the dea
20 : 37, 38, plainly teach
rsurrection, they live unt
the dead, and calleth thos
as though they were." R

Luke 16 : 22. As Bro
argument on this accoun
Lazarus, I have only to r
bolic or allegorical chara
no application to the que
not admitted, the represent
sufferings and Lazarus' joy
is fatal to the opinion of t
*dis*embodied spirits in the i

Acts 7 : 59. "How co
receive my spirit,' if, upon
together dust?" I reply,
the infallible promise of hi

ples. If the latter, it affords no evidence relative to the question at issue. If the former, it is more than a "shadow of proof" of the resurrection of Moses, against which, I know of no solid objection.

Matt. 22 : 32. Our brother's argument is ingenious, but it is fallacious. Its fallacy consists in overlooking the true subject of consideration. There is not the least reference to the present state of the patriarchs, excepting that they were dead. Whether or not they were *then* existing, was not the question of the Sadducees, who believed that death terminated human existence. *The doctrine of the resurrection* was the sole subject of consideration. To this, and this only, our Lord's answer and reasoning pertinently applies. Mark, "As touching THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead but of the living." What is the argument here of our blessed Lord? Is it that the patriarchs must be now living, in order that God may be the God of the living. *No, verily.* The argument of the faithful Witness is, that *they must be raised from the dead*, or God would be the God of the dead. Now it is manifest, that if the patriarchs were existing in glory, as our brother seems to suppose, God would be the God of the living, if there is no resurrection of the dead. So by our brother's plausible reasoning, the entire force of our Savior's argument is completely nullified. The passage, so far from sustaining the popular opinion, manifestly subverts it. Our brother may ask, is it not a matter of fact, according to the sentiment we advocate, that "God is *now*, at least, the God of the dead?" I reply that Luke 20 : 37, 38, plainly teaches that, *in view of their resurrection*, they live unto "God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which are not as though they were." Rom. 4 : 17.

Luke 16 : 22. As Bro. H. does not "rest any argument on this account of the rich man and Lazarus, I have only to remark, that, if its parabolic or allegorical character is admitted, it has no application to the question at issue. If it is not admitted, the representation of the rich man's sufferings and Lazarus' joys in an *embodied* state, is fatal to the opinion of the joys and miseries of *dis*embodied spirits in the intermediate state.

Acts 7 : 59. "How could Stephen pray 'Lord receive my spirit,' if, upon expiring, he became altogether dust?" I reply, as the dying martyr had the infallible promise of his Savior that he would "raise him up at the last day," it was perfectly proper for him to commit his spirit or vital breath—his life, into his Redeemer's hand. Stephen is dead—the *entire man* is dead; but his "life is hid, (*concealed*, not manifest, or conscious, any where,) with Christ in God," and when Christ his "Life shall appear," then shall "Stephen appear with him in glory." He had no pre-eminence over David in this respect, who has "not ascended into the heavens." Acts 2 : 34. We assure our respected brother, that the truth of God is, that he must "wait for his Son from heaven," to see him, and to enter into the joy of his Lord. It is this truth which gives significance to the petition, "Even so come Lord Jesus," to which we cordially respond our—Amen. HENRY GREW.

THE DRAGON.

We expressed the opinion in 1849, that the Russion Dynasty is the Dragon Power of Rev. 16th and 20th chapters. A part of the article of 1849 we republished March 1st, of the present year, with further remarks on the probable defeat and binding of the Russian power in the present conflict. We well knew that our views on that subject differed from some persons who had a theory to sustain, and hence could see nothing with favor that crossed their path. Some mocked us, and some pitied us for our folly, and went on their own chosen way, with flaming boasts of "*Russia Triumphant and Europe bound!*" We had however, only stated "*our opinion.*" A positive spirit on these matters of prophecy—especially unfulfilled ones—we feel no sympathy with; and persons who persist in such a spirit, after the experience of the past, we regard as unsafe expositors, because self is evidently magnified above truth in such minds.

The opinions we expressed in relation to Russia, in 1849 and in March last, are unaltered by any thing we have seen written of a contrary character; and the events of the war, so far, go to confirm us in the opinions then expressed. We have been satisfied, for months past, that the Russian power was greatly magnified above the truth, and that the Ottoman power was far too much underrated. We prepared an article last fall on the latter subject, but concluded to lay it aside and wait the developements of the conflict. We believed, and often said last fall, that if France and England had not controlled the Porte and caused him to keep Omar Pasha back from active hostilities, he would have driven the Russians out of the Principalities before the winter set in. The bravery, skill and success of the Turks since, has con-

firmed us in the opinion thus expressed near ten months ago.

We have seen nothing from any quarter that so well corresponds with our views of Russian power and affairs, as an editorial article in the *New York Tribune* of the 11th inst. From that article we give the following extracts, and we hope those who can see nothing but Russia's power and Russia's triumph, will lay these remarks to heart: it may save them from deep mortification, if nothing more. The Emperor of Russia has been inflated by fulsome adulation heaped upon him, till he, fool like, thought he was destined of God to "bind Europe," and ride "triumphant" whither soever he pleased. But the "hook is in his" haughty "jaws," and surely it looks as if "*a great chain*" was fast surrounding his dynasty. Yet we make no positive assertions on that point: we only say—so it looks to us. Time will determine the fact; for that we wait. The *Tribune* speaks as follows:

A certain class of writers have been wont to attribute to the Emperor of Russia the possession of extraordinary powers of mind, and especially of that far-reaching, comprehensive judgment which marks the really great statesman. It is difficult to see how such illusions could be derived from any truthful view of his character, or from any part of his history; but the most obstinate of his admirers must, we think, now question the justice of their conclusions. Russia is now in a most difficult and humiliating position. Her armies are defeated in Turkey, and, after immense losses of men and means, are retreating within her own frontiers; her possessions in Asia, the fruit of many years effort and vast expenditure, are partly lost and wholly imperiled; her foreign commerce is destroyed and her home industry injured by turning the national attention and the people's energies to a useless and disastrous war; her navy is imprisoned and her fortresses menaced; and she must even regard as an advantage an intervention which, whatever its other benefits, interposes an effectual barrier to the realization of her ambitious dreams, and renders impossible a renewal of her attack on Turkey, because that would involve a direct collision with Germany as well as with the Western powers. And all this is the work of this great statesman and wise ruler Nicholas I. Praise of this headstrong imperial blunderer's mental gifts must hereafter be considerably qualified, if indulged in at all. * * * The Russian army, with its enormous numbers and its whole swarms of officers, cannot afford leaders to take the place of Pashkiewitch, Gorchakoff, Schilders, and Luders, who were killed or disabled in the desperate and confused operations against Silistria. Indeed, old as these men are—Pashkiewitch and Gorchakoff being each above 70, and Luders, the youngest, being above 60—and likely as they were to die a natural death any day, such is the narrowness and imbecility of the system on which the Czar has managed his vast military establishment that we can affirm it as a positive and undeniable fact, that there is hardly a single officer who could step into the vacuted place of either of these generals, and carry with him the confidence of the army and the nation. * * * The army is commanded on the average by old valetudinarians or by ignorant corporals, who might manage a platoon, but have not brains and knowledge enough to direct the extensive and complicated movements of a campaign.

The same narrow-mindedness and presumption appear throughout the Czar's whole management of this Eastern question. Every one can now see that he began the war in an unwise and inadequate manner. Indeed, his very first military demonstration was totally absurd and unequal to the purpose in hand. He ought to have known that Europe would not allow the destruction of Turkey, and should, therefore, either have kept quiet, biding his time, or have crossed the Pruth, not with between forty and fifty thousand men, as he did last year, when during the whole winter he had only one army-corps in the Principalities, but should have pounced at once with his most powerful masses upon Turkey, reaching across the Balkan, before the Turks could have gathered together their scattered forces, and before the Western Powers could have combined in their opposition and sent fleets or troops. To strike by surprise and terror, ought to have been his aim, instead of engaging in such an imbecile manner his nation in a gigantic struggle. But Nicholas is growing old, and has all the faults of decrepit age. One of the reasons which prevented him from putting all his resources into action at once, was, that he feared the cost of such an effort. Now he will lose a hundred times more money, and without results. Penny-wisdom in such an affair is no wisdom at all.

When the Russian forces first crossed the Pruth, the Czar had no doubt,—as we happened to know and took occasion to state at the time,—that he could bully all Europe, and reap laurels at small expense. His diplomatic agents, too, encouraged him in this foolish opinion. The most mischevous of these accessories to the great Russian blunder has proved to be the Russian Minister at Paris, M. de Kisseleff, whose dispatches were full of the most satisfactory accounts concerning the friendly and pacific intentions of Louis Napoleon. The Czar, accordingly, who delights to read adulatory and flattering reports from his agents, caught at the bait, and any dispatch smelling of a disagreeable truth from any quarter was discredited, treated with contempt, and did nothing but injury with the Autocrat to the faithful and able diplomatist sending it. Thus nearly all the Russian diplomatic reports were full of encomiums on the imperial sagacity, to which Europe bowed, as they assured his Majesty, with respect and admiration. In one word, we are able to affirm that since 1851, Nicholas has never had laid before him a truthful account of the state of Europe, and of the feelings of the other Governments towards him and Russia; and if his numerous agents misled him in such a manner, the reason was that this was the most, nay, the only, palatable dish for his political appetite. He craved universal adulation; now he tastes its bitter and poisonous fruits.

BIBL

NO IMMORTALITY,

VOL. IX.

PUBLISHED S

At No. 140

TERMS---One D

Always in

GEO. STORRS, EDITO

SPI

OR, THE HEBREW TE
'NESHAMAH," AND THE

BY REV. WM. GLEN M

[Continued fr

NESHAMAH—*Seco*

SEC. I. NESHAMAH, *math*) is a noun: the ver Gesenius says the verb is Bible. *Neshamah* is the Professor Lees' Lexicon: be mentioned that *neshan* the Hebrew Bible.

SEC. II. NESHAMAH i

Gen. 2: 7, "And the L the dust of the ground, a trils the breath (nishmatl a living soul."

Concerning this text, wh plained by us at some len 6, we would further rema

a. That what in this ve of life, is, in the followi *ruach* of life. Gen. 6: 1 waters upon the earth, to is the breath (ruach) of and everything that is in Gen. 7: 15, "and they v ark, two and two of all fle (ruach) of life." The *nis* life are the same thing;— breath that preserves ali globe's surface.

b. This breath was not a Adam; by its influence th made alive. According t was completely formed of not a part essential to him ed to be added: the only the dust-formed man shoul kened to consciousness, an the other functions peculi of created beings. The br to the man already formed

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, AUGUST 1, 1854. NO. 15.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT:

OR, THE HEBREW TERMS "RUACH" AND "NESHAMAH," AND THE GREEK TERM "PNEUMA."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 214.]

NESHAMAH—*Second Hebrew Term.*

SEC. I. NESHAMAH, (constructive form *nishmath*) is a noun: the verb is *nasham*, to *breathe*. Gesenius says the verb is not found in the Hebrew Bible. *Neshamah* is the synonym for *Ruach*. See Professor Lees' Lexicon: *ruach* II. It should also be mentioned that *neshamah* occurs but seldom in the Hebrew Bible.

SEC. II. NESHAMAH is rendered *breath*.

Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath (nishmath) of life, and man became a living soul."

Concerning this text, which has already been explained by us at some length in "Soul" pp. 4, 5, 6, we would further remark here.

a. That what in this verse is called the *nishmath* of life, is, in the following passages, styled the *ruach* of life. Gen. 6: 17, "I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life, from under heaven, and everything that is in the earth shall die:"—Gen. 7: 15, "and they went unto Noah in the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life." The *nishmath* and the *ruach* of life are the same thing;—the breath of life, or the breath that preserves alive all animals on the globe's surface.

b. This breath was not a living being; it was not Adam; by its influence the man Adam was simply made alive. According to the text before us he was completely formed of the dust of the ground: not a part essential to him as a human being needed to be added: the only thing required was that the dust-formed man should be made alive—awakened to consciousness, and the performance of all the other functions peculiar to the human order of created beings. The breath was not an addition to the man already formed; it merely introduced him into a new condition, or it animated the being. "The Lord God formed MAN of the *dust* of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," or person. God breathed, we are informed, into his nostrils the breath of life,—thereby inflated his lungs; in the act of their expansion with the vital air, the heart would begin to beat, and henceforth the breathing would proceed by the God-imparted and God-sustained energy of the organization itself. The origin of man cannot be too carefully noted, and the record is so plain that a child may easily understand it. Adam was formed "of the dust of the ground," or of world-matter; and EVE was no less material in her entire being, for it is said, "The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and he (God), took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the *rib*, which the Lord God had taken from man, MADE HE A WOMAN, and brought her unto man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman because SHE WAS TAKEN OUT OF MAN," Gen. 2: 21, 22, 23. We have no mention of how she was made alive; but the record concerning Adam furnishes us with all requisite information to guide us to an understanding of the mode; the Lord God would also breathe into her nostrils the breath of life, and she would become a living soul, or person, likewise.

c. There is not one word in the narrative of man's creation, that gives the smallest countenance to the popular idea regarding the *spirit* of man. At his creation he received from the Almighty the breath of life; but so far from teaching us that the material organization was merely to be the fleshly dwelling of an immaterial and deathless spirit,—indeed of the man himself, for *personality* is now invariably associated with the spirit of man, or the man considered as a spirit—the narrative of the creation inculcates the *very reverse*. Personality is there connected with the organization, not with its *neshamah* or *ruach*, The organization is the first idea; what was imparted after the building up of the organization is subordinate. The breath, as already stated, was not a part of him, it merely made him a living agent. Now, on the supposition that the common notions about man are true, let us candidly ask, whether should we expect the organization of man, or the immensely important point his spirit—in fact *himself*—to be urged conspicuously before our view in the creation-history? Surely what is called the house is less important than its inhabitant,—the instrument than the agent to employ it,—the feeble shadow than the actual and momentous reality? Moreover, it seems reasonable to expect that what is not within the reach

of vision and, if we may so say, of experiment, will be more likely to constitute the subject of Divine narration than what is sensible and most easily discoverable. That the organization in man was of dust, or matter, could be easily detected and that unerringly too; but the spirit: how shall man learn that he has that, indeed that he himself is spirit, and that the fleshly structure is only his dwelling, and his instrument for thought and action? This spirit is invisible, impalpable, immortal; and confessedly beyond the sphere of sensible observation and experiment. Was it not of importance that the fact of his being spirit should be known to man? Was it not necessary that this should be chiefly impressed upon him? Shall he be told of his organization and left ignorant of his spirit, in fact of himself? Shall the building of the house be described, and the tenant be utterly forgotten?

These questions, if considered for a moment, will suggest to any mind, their appropriate and natural response. Let the reader, after pondering them for a little, turn and calmly read the account of the creation of Adam and Eve, and see how very different it is from what the popular theory about the being man would certainly lead us to expect. How simple, and yet how sublime withal! Man is formed of dust, and then he is made alive in the manner described by the pen of inspiration. The whole of the volume harmonizes with this account of man; he is of *dust*, and at death returns to his kindred element. "His breath goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts *perish*," Ps. 146 : 4.

Gen. 7 : 22, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."

In this verse the two Hebrew words with which we are dealing occur. This fact is not noted in the English text, though it is discoverable in the *marginal* reading, which runs thus—"the breath of the spirit of life" (nishmath—ruach). The breath of the spirit of life, is literally, the breath of the breath of life; and for a creature to have this, is to have a portion of the breath of life, or a portion of that *ruach* or *neshamah* that preserves all organized beings alive. All who had this perished,—died, in the flood; and undoubtedly each in the *same sense*, as in the same manner and circumstances.

1 Kings 17: 17, "There was no breath (neshamah) left in him."

The child had ceased to breathe, he was dead, or on the very brink of dying.

Job 33 : 4, "The breath (nishmath) of the Almighty hath given me life."

The breath of life is called the "breath of the Almighty," because he is its author.

We may observe that the same language occurs in the Hebrew Bible, in Job 32 : 8, "the *inspiration* (nishmath) of the Almighty giveth them (men) understanding." The inspiration is, the in-breathing of the Almighty. The meaning is, God gives breath to men, or he preserves men breathing the vital air, the consequence of which is they live, and exercise understanding, one of the many functions of the animated being man. As we judge, the passage has no reference to inspiration theologically understood,—that inspiration given to prophets and apostles; it describes how it is that man, as man, exercises the thinking powers common to each member of the race. It brings him, as a living creature, very near to the Almighty. It represents him as immediately dependent on his Creator for the prolongation of life and its phenomena, and is thus parallel to the declaration, "He is not far from every one of us, for in him we live and move and have our being." Acts 17 : 27, 28.

Job 34 : 14, "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit" (ruchu), that is, the spirit God had given him, "and his breath" (venishmathi), i. e. the breath God had given. What would be the consequence to men? Would they depart to exist in consciousness somewhere else in space? No; the next verse proceeds, "all flesh SHALL PERISH together; and MAN SHALL TURN AGAIN UNTO DUST."

Job 27 : 3, "all the while my breath (nishmathi) is in me; and the spirit of God (margin, 'the *breath* which God gave him') in my nostrils."

His breath was also God's, inasmuch as it came from the Creator. What is here called "my breath," and "the spirit" or breath "of God" is, in Gen. 2 : 7, denominated the "breath of life."

Job 37 : 10, "By the breath (nishmath) of God frost is given." "The breath of God" here means, *the cold wind*. Ps. 150 : 6, "Let every thing that hath breath (*neshamah*) praise the Lord;" i. e., let every living creature praise the Lord. Isa. 2 : 22, "Cease ye from man, whose breath (*neshamah*) is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?"

For man to have his breath in his nostrils, is to have an existence frail and fleeting. "As for man his days are as the grass." Ps. 103 : 15; and Ps. 39 : 4. His days, not on earth, but his days as man, are as grass.

Isa. 30 : 33, "The breath" (nishmath), or the anger "of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it" (Tophet). Isa. 42 : 5, "He giveth breath (neshamah) unto the people upon it (the earth); and spirit (ruach) to them that walk therein." Compare Job 27 : 3, and 34 : 14, quoted above. Here, probably, "spirit" stands for *life*, the result of breathing. Dan. 5 : 23, "The God in whom thy breath" (*nishmah*)—thy life "is,—hast thou not glorified." Dan. 10 : 17, "Straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is their breath (neshamah) left in me."

Sec. III. NESHAMAH, like *ruach*, is rendered *blast*.

2 Sam. 22 : 16, "At the blast (nishmath) of the breath (*ruach*) of his nostrils." Job 4 : 9, "By the blast" (nishmath) or anger "of God they perish." Ps. 18 : 15, "O Lord, at the blast (nishmath) of the breath of thy nostrils."

Sec. IV. NESHAMAH, in constructive form, is once translated "spirit."

Prov. 20 : 27, "The spirit (nishmath) of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the belly."

The word *nishmath* here appears to designate

the powers of conscience and self-consciousness which are essential characteristics of a human being. A God-produced discernment of inward and outward right and wrong belongs to men. God as it were in the man, teaches him right and wrong; or what is right and wrong in the sight of the Creator is, by the human moral and intellectual capacities, revealed to each member of our race. With us conscience is popularly called "the voice of God;" and Solomon here styles it "the candle of the Lord," and both forms of speech embody a universally understood and universally acknowledged fact in the human constitution.

What is here ascribed to the "spirit of man," inasmuch as it is by the respiration of *nishmath chayim* (Gen. 2.: 7), i. e. "the breath of life," or vital air, that every operation belonging to man is performed, is, in other parallel passages, connected with his "HEART." For instance, 1 John 3: 20, 21, "If our *heart* condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things: beloved if our *heart* condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." (See also, Judges 5: 16; 1 Sam. 24: 5; and Rom. 2: 15.) Now, who really believes the heart in his bosom condemns or approves his conduct? What man on earth believes his heart to be himself, a distinct living entity, capable of existing after death? And why believe these things of the *nishmath*, the breath or spirit? The inspired writers employed current phraseology in using the words "spirit" and "heart," and are no more to be understood as teaching us that the mental functions, obviously imported by them in such cases, are executed either by the "heart" or the "spirit," than they are to be held as really declaring God himself to be possessed of a "heart," or "bowels," or "nostrils," or "feet," or "hands," which are freely ascribed to him in the sacred volume. The fundamental idea is that THE BEING MAN has these mental attributes, or performs the acts of condemnation and approval of himself and his neighbors; and it matters not what part of him they are immediately connected with, or by the name of what physical organ belonging to him they are called, like the "heart" for example, or should it even be the very breath itself which gives animation and energy to all.

Sec. V. NESHAMAH is used in several instances to express *a living human being*.

Deut. 20: 16, "thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth," literally, 'not shalt thou save alive all breath' (neshamah), i. e. thou shalt save no living being, or man. The same idea is expressed differently at the commencement of the succeeding verse:—"But thou shalt utterly destroy them," &c.

Josh. 10: 40, "utterly destroyed all that breathed"—literally, 'all the breath' (neshamah); i. e. every living being. 11: 11, "There was not left any to breathe" (*neshamah*), margin, "any breath," i. e., any living being. 11: 14, "neither left he any to breathe" (neshamah), or any man alive. 1 Kings 15: 29, "he left not to Jeroboam any that breathed" (neshamah); or *any breath*; any breathing being.

Sec. VI. NESHAMOTH, the plural form of *neshamah*, is once rendered "*souls*."

Isa. 57: 16, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit (ruach) should fail before me, and the souls (neshamoth) which I have made."

"The exact sense of the Hebrew" (neshamoth), says Prof. Alexander on this verse, "is *breaths*;" here it stands, as in the examples given in the last section, for human beings. There are two parallels in the whole verse, the first couple are these,

"For I will not contend for ever,
Neither will I be always wroth;"

and they express the same idea. The second couple are,

"For the spirit should fail before me,
And the souls"—breaths—"which I have made;"

and they also embody the same thought, viz., that men would utterly perish, were God to act as indicated by the first two lines. To bear the Divine wrath, then, for ever is beyond the endurance of any human being. Does not this, by the way, contradict very explicitly the hideous dogma of eternal torments?

"The learned," says Dr. Clarke, "have taken a great deal of pains to little purpose on the latter part of this verse, which they suppose to be very obscure. After all their labors upon it, I think the best and easiest explication of it is given in the two following elegant passages of the Psalms, which, I presume, are exactly parallel to it, and very clearly express the same sentiment.

"But he in his tender mercy will forgive their sin,
And will not *destroy* them;
Yea, oftentimes will he turn away his wrath,
And will not rouse up his indignation:
For he remembereth that they are BUT FLESH,
A *breath* that *passeth*, and returneth not.
Ps. 78: 38, 39.

"He will not always contend,
Neither will he for ever hold his wrath;
As a father yearneth toward his children,
So is Jehovah tenderly compassionate towards them that fear him;
For he knoweth our frame;
He remembereth that WE ARE BUT DUST."
Ps. 103: 9, 13, 14.

Will the reader believe it, that this good and learned man, immediately after presenting the above passages as a development of the sense of the verse before us, proceeds immediately to explain "the souls" (neshamoth—'breaths'), as meaning "immortal spirits!" The pious Commentator's creed spake about "immortal spirits" to him; but neither is the phrase "immortal spirit," nor the idea it embodies, contained within the boards of the Book. The language of Dr. C. about "immortal spirits," as being referred to in the text, contradicts in the most palpable manner his own words. He says the passages from the Psalms are "*exactly parallel*" to the verse under examination, and no language could be better chosen to utter the ideas that man, as a being, is *flesh*, and not *spirit*; that he is *mortal*, and not *deathless*. "He remembereth that *they* are *but flesh*, a *breath* that passeth and returneth not"—"He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that WE ARE BUT DUST.

UNCONSCIOUSNESS IN DEATH.

By Dr. John Fondey, Philadelphia.

Br. Storrs:—In reference to the subject of the unconscious state of the dead, it strikes me that if one point was explained, it would give men a clearer view of the matter, and I will simply throw out the hint for consideration. It is this: We know that when man is alive he is conscious—this, we have been taught, is owing to the presence of a distinct thinking principle in him. When he dies we have been told this principle, which gave him consciousness, has departed, and still retains the power of knowing. *You* maintain that no such principle was imparted to man; that the breath of life, or a *living principle*, was put into him, which has no consciousness in itself; that when this union takes place, then consciousness follows, and when this union is dissolved consciousness ceases. Now the opponents of this truth know what your views are—but they know also that God is a Spirit—they consider man to have been created in his image—this image, they consider not only a moral but a mental image, that is, a capacity of thinking. Now these views of theirs they cannot reconcile with your own; they cannot understand how the simple union of the breath of life with the body produces thought, and of course *cannot see* how unconsciousness can be the result of its abstraction. Men want to know the *reasons* of things! the *cause*—how can such a result be produced by the union of the principle of life with a bodily organization? Why, very easily, if God has so arranged matters. And has not God so ordered many things in the natural world, that results almost as wonderful are witnessed? Why do flint and steel, when struck together, produce sparks? Why do small bodies gravitate towards larger ones? Why does light, when admitted to a healthy eye, where the brain is also healthy, disclose to us the beauties of creation? Simply because God has so arranged matters, that when two or more things are brought into contact, certain phenomena are the result. Take the lowest orders of animals, and how far removed from man? Take those which approach the nearest to man, and in how many respects, perhaps not in outward form, but in mental manifestation, do they resemble man; and why the difference? Because in the lowest orders of animals there is the least, and in the higher order of animals the greatest approach to the organization of man. The principal point of difference, and the cause of the difference, is to be found in the nervous structure. The lowest animals have a low order and small amount of nervous structure, the higher animals a higher order of nervous structure, with a larger amount of it. Hence the higher order of animals seem to think and reason. Now if the soul be a distinct thinking principle, then these animals have souls also. The reason why these animals differ so much, I conceive to depend altogether on their structure. And the reason that man differs so much from them, arises, I conceive, from the higher organization he possesses. He has a higher order of brain and more of it, in those parts which phrenology shows are appropriated to the exhibition of the higher manifestations. His body is full of organs, which vary in their organization, and are acted upon by the same principle of life, and yet owing to their peculiar structure they produce dissimilar results. The liver forms bile, the glands of the eye tears, and so on with the different organs; but with respect to the brain, its organization is peculiar, and God has so arranged it that *when this brain is healthy and is acted upon by the principle of life*, it SHALL PRODUCE THOUGHT. How much the infant resembles the lower order of animals, but as it grows and its brain enlarges and acquires consistency, its mental and moral powers develop. If its brain is of an unhealthy character, or deficient, there is weakness of mind or idiocy. As the old man becomes diseased, his brain partakes of disorder and he returns to a state of childhood. If God had put into man a distinct thinking principle, would it thus be fettered by the organization?—No. When disease clogs up and obstructs the organs, the principle of life is withdrawn. It goes to God—he takes back the energy that while united with the organization produced such wonderful results. The brain has nothing now to stimulate it to action—*it cannot produce thought*. That is its duty, and office, while the living principle acts upon it; when that departs, its work is done—it ceases to think—his body comes under the same laws that govern vegetable matter—decomposition results. Hence he cannot be conscious in *the arrangement* of things until the resurrection—then his organization is restored, and also the principle of life—then he will think and feel and act. To my mind the subject of the intermediate and unconscious state of the dead is as plain a truth as any other in God's word. One thing, perhaps, that makes it much clearer to my mind, is, that I can, without violation of the rules of man's organization, understand how it is that man can thus become conscious or unconscious from the presence or absence of the principle of life. And there is a glory about the resurrection that I never before realized.

CHINESE BARBARITY.

"O HORRIBLE! O HORRIBLE! MOST HORRIBLE!"

The following case of judicial vengeance was lately reported from the empire of China, and published in our magazines and newspapers:—

"A Chinese merchant named Hiamly, convicted of having killed his wife, was sentenced to die by the total deprivation of sleep. The execution took place at Amoy. The condemned was placed in prison, under the charge of three guardians, who relieved each other every alternate hour, and who prevented him from taking any sleep, night or day. He lived thus for nineteen days, without having slept for a single minute. At the commencement of the eighth day his sufferings were so cruel, that he begged as a great favor that they would kill him by strangulation."

Here is a criminal (and we would be the last to reduce the enormity of his guilt) sentenced to die, but the manner of his execution is awfully revolting. There was in it a refinement of barbarity, that was at least fully equal to the devices of the atrocious misnamed christian inquisitors of Rome, who

slaughtered thousands for the extirpation of heresy. Who does not, in his heart, loathe the tribunal that could pronounce such a doom, and the hireling monsters who could carry it into execution? As for the poor wretch himself, how dreadful must his sufferings have been,—day after day with a burning, swimming brain, and boiling blood. Not a moment of repose, himself compelled to be his own tormentor. One sees the wild blood-shot eyes, the emaciated trembling form, the imploring look for some kind hand to end, however violently, his intolerable woe. "He begged as a great favor that they would kill him by strangulation," after he had undergone seven days of the agony. And can we wonder at it? He asked it as a favor,—he would have given thousands of gold for that release—he longed for death more intensely than he had ever pled for the preservation of his days. What his barbarian attendants refused, by and bye was granted by the last friend of the wretched in this world. It is consolation—a wild one, no doubt—that the anguish in his case must have an end; there is a limit beyond which cruelty may not pass, and the grave sooner or later opens its portals for the exhausted child of pain. He expired at length, and found the couch "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

How would the reader have felt had he passed the prison, say on the tenth day, and been informed of the tragedy of barbarism that was performing within? It would have haunted his sensitive heart and his midnight dreams, if it did not banish repose from his eyelids. The supposition is only human; to imagine anything else would be to fancy that men had been converted into relentless fiends, or into walking images of stone. How does the reader, we again demand, conceive he would have felt, had he been told, on a day, that the weary hours of the culprit were concluded, that he was now beyond the reach of pain? Would he not have experienced an indescribable relief to his heart? cried out, in the instinctive overflowing of his humanity, God be praised!

It is in cases like these that we feel kindly toward Death, otherwise abhorrent as the King of Terrors. We look forward to his approach with ardent desire, and when he has performed his emancipating and composing service on behalf of the agonized, even though they are dishonored by acts of blackest criminality, we cannot but be thankful that his arm has been extended with resistless power.

And what shall we think of the dogma of endless torments beyond the grave—torments to be imposed by him who reveals himself as the God of love? We revolt at the contemplation of the Chinese barbarity,—shall we feel otherwise toward cruelty in another realm, inflicted by a greater power? Eighteen days' torments on earth harrows our nature, shall we imagine hell's perpetual agonies, and continue insensible, yea, be expected to approve? No; the better feelings of man rise up in arms against the imposition. We denounce the infliction as inexpressibly savage. But when we utter against it our unqualified anathema, we are set against no Divine arrangement. On the contrary, we are merely scorning a wild fiction of the human brain, baptized by the appellation of a Scriptural doctrine. "The wages of sin is death," and not those agonies that a cruel theology has invented, alike to the dishonor of God, and the alienation of man from his service.

You abhor the Chinese cruelty,—can you laud a sleepless infliction for unending ages?

You could scarcely have sunk to rest had you been told, in passing along the prison wall, of the agonies on the other side of it, supposing even the man to have been to you a stranger, and one confessedly dyed in blood. Can you sleep now, when you probably believe that myriads are tossing somewhere in uninterrupted misery, and among them is, may be, your father or your child? What kind of place would heaven be to you were the tremendous thought to brood over your heart, that, in some distant realm, your former associates and relatives,—multitudes of your fellow-creatures,—were tossing on the red billows of scorching, but unconsuming wrath?

"The thought that any should have endless woe,
Would cast a shadow on the throne of God
And darken heaven."

The death of the Chinese criminal was longed for by you, and also by himself; you felt a deliverance when his bitter agonies were closed. Is it possible you could think of hell's sorrows and have no desire to see them terminated,—no wish that death would come with his cold, yet soothing hand, and lay the victim to rest? Is death better than God? Are you kinder than the Almighty? You would find comfort if these tempestuous woes were ended. Can you imagine that He will have satisfaction in prolonging their duration and giving them augmenting intensity? You abhor, then, the dogma of ceaseless torments for man or devil. See that you defend the character of God from the black aspersions that are—we doubt not by mistake—thrown upon it. Tell the world that He is the righteous, and not the relentless, Governor of the universe,—that he holds out immortality to the pure and pious, and has written it on the judgment-book, that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."—*Moncrieff's Expositor*, Scotland.

WITH GOD.

"While I was musing, the fire burned, then spake I with my tongue."—Ps. 39: 3.

This afternoon the sun went down to his rest enveloped in robes of crimson and gold; he quickly disappeared, as if weary of looking down on a world like this; and yet the manner of his departing was expressive of hope and encouragement, rather than of scorn and disgust. I watched till the last beam expired, and was saddened by the vision. I felt as if a great friend of humanity had gone. How awful had been the feeling, if no assurance had been possessed, that the great orb would again appear, and dispense his cheering illumination. To bid farewell to the sun—to know that one had witnessed his glory for the last time,—what a thought! Henceforth darkness, sterility, and death; the conception is enough. Dark as it is now, and the night is as yet moonless and star-

less, the gloom will rise like a veil from the face of nature; and, in a few hours, the stream of splendor from the orient fountain, will be flooding all with brightness, as fresh as on that morning when the voice of heaven approved the production of Omnipotent energy and skill. How majestic and stupendous the machinery of nature. How awful the constancy; and yet how varied; how startling, how ravishing at times, the changes that occur. God is here; my Father,—the Universal Parent,—presides over all these movements, and carries them on with untiring might. This afternoon, I saw Him guide the blazing luminary along its course; I saw him gather around it at last, all the splendor of imperial state; I saw him lead out the shades of evening from their mysterious chambers; and I heard him, as it were, say, "Fear not; I remain, though the sun departs; and even it will by and by return." Thou art here, O my Father, and I see Thee not; this room is full of Thee; the great palace of creation, on which I look out from my window, is full of thy glory. I do not see Thee! I do see Thee! Thou art invisible to the eye; visible to the thought, the discernment. I am exposed to Thy view, as a watch when opened is disclosed to the eye. May the order of my being be Thine! May my faithfulness in Thy service meet Thy approval.

God is silent; He speaks; He is at rest; He rushes on; He is near; He is far away. How wonderful art Thou, O God! O *my* God! When the forces the Almighty has generated, for instance, the storm, the earthquake, the lightning, the volcano, are so tremendous, how vast the immeasurable power in His arm. Were He merely intelligence and power, His presence would be terrible; but He is love,—He is a Father, and He may be regarded with perfect confidence and joy. Let the universe even shake, His servants need fear no more than the child when his mother rocks the cradle. Infinite God come near me, and pour Thy love into my heart; I am Thy child, and I wish to be shielded by Thy might; I would draw nearer Thee, I would seize the skirt of Thy gargarment, yea, I would hold Thy hand, I would hear the beating of Thy most tender heart. Say to me, "My child;" I say to Thee, "O my Father."

God kindles the stars; all eyes see them, many see beyond them,—and they are blest. Above, all is clear and serene; no storms reach yon distant realms; the home of the eternal stars is unruffled, like the clime of the immortals. Below there is gloom and storm, sometimes light and calm. The greatest darkness, however, is that which is found in the minds of men; the most awful storms are those which agitate the hearts of guilty sinners. Darkness there, and few to give light! storms there, and few to say, "Peace, be still!" Alas! my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh, ye are dear to me, and I would speak of the darkness that prevails, and of the few stars—the gleams of truth and hope,—not yet eclipsed; and of the morning that is coming,—when a day of preternatural glory will dawn upon our world. God is love, He loves you; and though legions of men and demons should affirm the contrary, believe them not. He sent His Son to save *you*. I would proclaim to each child of man, and encourage him to receive the sin-dispelling and death-conquering Redeemer as his friend, and the pledge of the divine compassion. No wanderer need despair,—no sinner need die; for the voice from heaven is the voice of mercy; and the gift from heaven is "eternal life." God wishes to conquer man by love,—to gain human hearts as His prize and His joy.

"Nor gold, nor silver seek I; but above
All gifts, the heart, and buy it with my love.
God spurns the riches of a thousand coffers.
And says, "My chosen is he, his heart who offers."

The Exp. of Life, &c.

SIMPLICITY OF FAITH.

The simplicity of faith was once illustrated by a pastor thus:—

"I was preaching," he said, "my ordinary weekly lecture in the evening, when I was sent for in great haste, to visit a woman who was said to be dying, and who very much desired to see me. I closed the service as soon as I could, and went immediately to her house. She was a member of my church, whom I had known very well for years, with whom I had been acquainted ever since her first serious impressions, before she became a communicant. As I entered the room where she lay, I found it filled with her friends who had gathered around to see her die. Making my way through the midst of them, I reached the side of her bed, and found her apparently in the last agonies of death. She was bolstered up in her bed, gasping for breath, almost suffocated by the asthma; and the whole bed shook by a palpitation of her heart, which seemed to be shaking her to pieces. It appeared to me that she could not live a quarter of an hour. I said to her—

"Mrs. M., you appear to be very sick."

"Yes," said she, "I am dying."

"And are you ready to die?"

She lifted her eyes upon me with a solemn and fixed gaze, and speaking with great difficulty, she replied—

"Sir, God knows—I have taken him—at his word—and—I am not afraid to die."

It was a new definition of faith. "I have taken him at his word." It struck me in an instant as a triumph of faith. "God knows I have taken him at his word, and I am not afraid to die." It was just the thing for her to say. I have often tried to think what else she could have said that would have expressed so much in so few words.

I prayed some four minutes by her bedside; recited to her some passages of God's word, and was about to leave her for a moment to her friends, whom she seemed anxious to address. She held me by the hand, and uttering a word at a time, as she gasped for breath, she said to me—

"I want to tell you—that I can—trust—in God—while—I am dying. You have—often told me—he would not—forsake me—and now I find—it true. I am—at peace. I die willingly—and happy."

In a few minutes I left her, uttering to her such

promises of the Saviour as I deemed most appropriate. However, she did not die.

She still lives. But that expression of her faith has been of great benefit to me. It has aided me in preaching, and in conversation with inquiring sinners very often. It gave me a more simple idea of faith than I ever had before. It put aside all the mists of metaphysics, speculation, and philosophizing. It made the whole nature of faith plain. Everybody could understand it: "God knows I have taken him at his word."—*Pastor's Sketches.*

On the State of Man in Death.

On the best consideration I have been able at various times to give the subject, having as evidence nothing more than the information which Scripture affords, but taking the whole of that information, I come to the satisfied conclusion that the interval between death and the resurrection is to the individual *a period of unconscious rest;*—that, consequently, to *him* death will be followed by the solemn summons to life, when that which is sown in weakness, dishonor and corruption, shall be raised in power, and glory, and immortality, and instead of perishing bodies we shall be clothed with those which shall be incorruptible, being fashioned like the glorious body of him to whom the Almighty Father hath given the power to subdue all things unto himself; that, consequently, the eye that closes one instant on the night of death, opens the next instant at the morning of an eternal day. —Dr. Lant Carpenter, *from an unpublished MS. in the possession of Mrs. Carpenter.*

HOW TO SPEAK TO CHILDREN.

It is usual to attempt the management of children either by corporeal punishment, or by rewards addressed to the senses, and by words alone. There is one other means of government, the power and importance of which are seldom regarded. I refer to the human voice. A blow may be inflicted, and accompanied with words so uttered, as to counteract entirely its intended effect; or the parent may use language, in the correction of the child, not objectionable in itself, yet spoken in a tone which more than defeats its influence. Let any one endeavor to recall the image of a fond mother long since at rest. Her sweet smile and ever clear countenance are brought vividly to recollection; so also is her voice; and blessed is that parent who is endowed with a pleasing utterance. What is it which lulls the infant to repose? It is not an array of mere words. There is no charm, to the untaught one, in letters, syllables, and sentences. It is the sound that strikes its little ear that soothes and comforts it to sleep. A few notes, however unskilfully arranged, if uttered in a soft tone, are found to possess a magic influence. Think we that this influence is confined to the cradle? No; it is diffused over age, and ceases not while the child remains under the parental roof. Is the boy growing rude in manner and boisterous in speech? I know of no instrument so sure to control these tendencies as the gentle tones of a mother. She who speaks to her son harshly does but give to his conduct the sanction of her own example. She pours oil on the already raging flame. In the pressure of duty, we are liable to utter ourselves hastily to children. Perhaps a threat is expressed in a loud and irritating tone; instead of allaying the passions of the child, it serves directly to increase them. Every fretful expression awakens in him the same spirit which produced it. So does a pleasant voice call up agreeable feelings. Whatever disposition, therefore, we would encourage in a child, the same should we manifest in the tone in which we address it.—*Chris. Reg.*

Heavenly Contemplation.—As Daniel, in his captivity, did three times a day open his window towards Jerusalem, though so far out of sight, when he went to God in his devotions; so may the believing soul in his captivity to the flesh, look towards Jerusalem which is above. As the pretty lark doth sing sweetly, and never cease her pleasant ditty while she hovereth aloft, as if she were there gazing into the glory of the sun, but is suddenly silenced when she falleth to the earth, so is the frame of the soul most delectable and divine, while it keepeth in the view of God by contemplation; but alas! we make there too short a stay; down again we fall, and lay by our music.—*Baxter.*

The Christian's Solace.

BY MRS. A. C. JUDSON.

"The triumphing of the wicked is short."—Job 20: 5.

In this day and time of evil, while "iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold," the wicked bear rule, and their nefarious plots are fully consummated,—how comforting to the lover of righteousness is this divine assurance: that their triumph *is short.*

Truly, they *have* triumphed, in spite of all the efforts of good men. Most emphatically, on every side, the "wicked bear rule." But, thanks be to God! His purposes will not fail. He hath "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness," and then will the scales be turned. The wicked will be driven away in his wickedness," and truth and holiness will prevail. Delightful hope! Heart-cheering consolation! Not one feeling of revenge or animosity dwells in the bosom of the true Christian—the holy God knoweth no such feelings. Yet we do rejoice to know that iniquity will be done away, and that the time will come when the whole earth shall be *full of the glory of the Lord.* And not one vestige of wickedness be found in all God's universe. The earth may now be convulsed, and tossed to and fro, as it were, with the earthquakes and volcanoes of evil; but by and bye the Prince of peace will wave his sceptre, and to the warring elements will cry, "Peace, be still!"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 1, 1854.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

"The intermediate state of the dead is a state of conscious existence." So saith "*Rev. D. W. Clark, D.D.*," of the Methodist E. Church.

We proceed in our notice of his articles in the Christian Advocate, which, it seems, were copied from the *Ladies' Repository*. The Doctor says—

"Philosophy has found itself able to solve but few of the subtle mysteries of the soul even in its present state. No wonder, then, that it is still less able to solve the mysteries of its separate state. Here it is blended with an organic, material body, and manifests its being, power, and condition in a thousand ways; and yet it must be confessed that, as to the modes of its existence—its peculiar relation to the body, its dependence upon it or control over it—we know comparatively little. How, then, can we expect to unravel all the mysteries of its separate state?"

Philosophy has never "found itself able to" show that man is possessed of such an entity as Theologians call "the soul." No wonder, then, that both Philosophers and Theologians "know comparatively little" about that which has no existence except in their imaginations. "The mysteries of the separate state" of such a soul it will take long for them to "unravel." But saith the Doctor—

"We are not left in any necessary darkness in relation to the great facts of that mysterious state. And perhaps the most important of all those facts—as it is fundamental to all the rest—is that which we have just announced; namely, THAT THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE DEAD IS A STATE OF CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE."

Was there ever a more palpable contradiction than is apparent in this "announced fundamental!" "The most important of all those facts" is, that "the state of the *dead* is" that they are *alive!* or, which is the same thing, they are in "conscious existence"! "Thou shalt surely die," Adam.—That is, "You shall go into another state of conscious existence!"

But our friend Clark proceeds to argue the case, and speaks thus—

"Does not God reveal to us this great fact—a fact that constitutes a broad platform upon which rest our most glorious hopes in relation to our intermediate state? If such be not the case, why did St. Paul 'desire to depart,' that he might 'be with Christ?' If the soul sleeps with the body till the resurrection of the dead, he would be no nearer to the accomplishment of his wish in dying than he was while he lived. Indeed, if the doctrine that the intermediate state is one of annihilation or of unconscious existence be true, St. Paul is no nearer heaven than he would be had he lived to the present hour. Neither is he so near the attainment of his desire now as he was during his life; for while he lived he enjoyed communion with Christ; but, being dead, even the communion he did enjoy is cut off, if the spirit sleeps with the body in unconscious repose. All intercourse with the Deity, with heaven, with the saints of God on earth, and even with the glorious truths of the gospel, is utterly broken off, and in one long, oblivious sleep have that intellect so vigorous, those affections so pure and so ardent, and those aspirations so glorious and sustaining, been pent for nearly eighteen centuries; and altogether unconscious of the history of the Church and of the fate of the gospel, of the glory of Christ or the bliss of heaven, while he still continue to slumber on till the trump of God shall arouse the unconscious dead at the resurrection morning. Call you this 'being with Christ?' Alas! then, what is it to be separated from him? If, between death and the resurrection, 'the soul is either extinct, or in a profound and dreamless sleep, forgetful of all that is past, ignorant of all that is around it, and regardless of all that is to come,' how fearfully mistaken was the great apostle when he desired to depart, in order that he might 'be with Christ!' Better, indeed, were it to return to life, for here we may see, even though it be only as through a glass darkly; but there we see not at all! It is, truly, *a land of darkness as darkness itself!*"

We love to be generous to an opponent, and we can afford to be; so we have given Br. Clark the benefit of his entire argument on this case of Paul. In the first place, Paul does not say that he wished to *die* to be with Christ. In the second place, Paul saith not one word about his *soul* in the text or context: and in the context he does say that he labored and suffered, "If," says he, "by any means I might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead;*" and he adds, "Our conversation is in heaven; FROM WHENCE also we *look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *change* our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body," &c.

Thus, in this very epistle, we see what was Paul's real *desire* and expectation: not that of departing and being with Christ as a *dis*embodied soul, but to have his "vile body" changed, and made like Christ's; not by death, nor at death, but by a *resurrection* when Christ shall *return from* heaven.

Paul's desire then to depart and be with Christ can have no reference to the state between death and the resurrection. It was not a *hope* of being with Christ at death; for hope is made up of desire and *expectation.* Paul expresses a desire to depart and be with Christ, but saith nothing of an expectation of being with Christ till the "vile *body*" is changed and made like to Christ's.—Hence Paul's desire to depart and be with Christ

was not a desire to have a *dis*embodied presence with Christ, but must have been a desire for *translation*, like Enoch and Elijah, which was better than either to live in this state or to die. If he could have a translation, that he should "not see death," he would prefer that to death; and thus to depart and be with Christ was a matter of innocent "desire;" but he expresses no expectation that his desire would be granted. Indeed, what follows shows he did not expect his desire to be granted; hence he labors to have part in the "resurrection," and looks for his change when Christ shall come *from* heaven.

The Apostle then was not "mistaken" about his "soul" being with Christ, in a conscious existence, between death and the resurrection, for he had no such expectation, and expresses no such desire:—that is a pure assumption, to which the universal teaching of Paul, in relation to the hope for the dead, is in complete and perfect hostility.

The Doctor concludes this case, by saying, if death is a state of unconsciousness, "It is truly a land of darkness as darkness itself!" That is—It is just what inspiration testifies it is, Job 10: 22. We marvel that our friend Clark should thus stumble into the truth. It is just as if he had said "If the dead are not in a conscious state, then the Spirit of God inspired a true sentiment when it caused Job to say, when a man is dead he is in a 'land of darkness as darkness itself.'" Truly, Br. Clark, your case is not quite hopeless if you have conscience left, and will not obstinately persist in "infidelity." The Doctor next brings up the case of the thief, and says—

"To the penitent thief upon the cross our Saviour said, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' On that very day both our Saviour and the penitent thief expired. Did he mean that the penitent thief would with him that day cease from all conscious existence? What mockery to make such a promise as an antidote to the agonies of the dying man!"

Here our friend makes short work, and decides the whole with a very brief assumption, which is false in fact. He says, "On that very day both our Saviour and the thief expired." Now it is a fact that the thief did *not* expire on the *very* day the Saviour did. And any one by comparing the Evangelists will see, that while Christ expired on that very day the thief was alive at the commencement of the *next* day, and had his legs broken to hasten his death. Let it be remembered the day always commenced at evening among the Jews.—Now read the Evangelists and see if the two deaths occurred in the "very day" the address was made to the thief. The thief's prayer is the clue to our Lord's answer. What was that prayer?—"Remember me when thou comest *into* thy kingdom." Archbishop Whately says, "*into* is a mistranslation; it should be *in* thy kingdom. The meaning is, at thy second coming in triumphant glory."—Bishop Whately on *Future States*, p. 324.

Thus understood the promise is, "This day, of which you have spoken, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Three days after this, Jesus expressly said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father," John 20: 17. Now if Paradise and heaven are one, as the Doctor holds, here is evidence positive that Jesus did *not* go to it the "very day" of his death, and had not been there for three days after. Our friend next leads on Moses and Elias. He says—

"Upon the mount of transfiguration Moses and Elias, though the one had been dead nearly fifteen hundred years, and the other had been translated over a thousand years before, not only appeared in the form of living men, though with bodies glorious—emblematic of the glorious resurrection state—but they also conversed; thus demonstrating that they were not only alive, but conscious. And if Moses has a conscious existence in the intermediate state, why may not all others?"

Here the Doctor admits that Moses appeared in a "glorious" *body:* then he must have had a resurrection from the dead; for they tell us the soul is *dis*embodied at death; but saith our friend these two men "appeared with *bodies* glorious." If then Moses was raised from the dead, for this occasion, it is proof against the Doctor's theory, and is no evidence of a living conscious existence in the intermediate state. But Doctor Clark adds, that these bodies were "*emblematic* of the glorious resurrection state." If then, they were emblematic they were not the real bodies of Moses and Elias; and hence the evidence is, that Moses was not really there, but only emblematically so, or it was a *visionary* representation of the future glory of Christ and his saints after the resurrection, and so affords not the slightest proof of a conscious intermediate state of dead men.

The Doctor proceeds in the following strains—

"While reasoning with the Sadducees, one of whose doctrines was that there is no spirit, no conscious existence independent of the body, our Saviour says, 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' And yet God said to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,' two hundred years after the dust of the last had been consigned to the cave purchased by Abraham in the field of Machpelah. Hence, it must follow, if there be any *verity* in God, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead, still had a conscious life. The same conclusion will be

reached with an equally invincible force, when we remember our Saviour himself declared, 'Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.'"

We confess ourself shocked at this paragraph for two reasons: *First*—It is a total misrepresentation of the case in hand. Though the Sadducees, as a matter of fact, denied the existence of spirits, neither that nor the conscious existence of dead men was at all the matter in hand in the discourse of our Saviour with them on the occasion here brought to view. Why then did my friend Clark state *two* things that were not the subject of discourse, and entirely hide, and not mention the real matter at issue, which was the "*resurrection of the dead?*" The very sound of the true issue would have opened the eyes of some of his readers to see that he evaded the doctrine of our Saviour's discourse, which was not about the conscious state of the dead, but of the rising from the dead; and it goes to show conclusively that if there is no resurrection there is no future life, and God could not be their God; but if they are alive *now*, as the Doctor affirms, then God can be their God whether there ever be a resurrection or not; and thus our Lord's argument for the resurrection is made "void through your tradition" of a living conscious state in death. But what particularly shocked us is, that the Doctor should affirm, "If there be any *verity*" [*truth*] "in God, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead, still had a conscious life!"

Now we would rather confess that we might be a thousand times *mistaken* than thus to stake the *veracity* of God. Look at it. "If I am not right in maintaining that the dead are in a state of conscious life there is not *any truth* in God; His word can in *no instance* be trusted."

We cannot but hope that Br. Clark will feel it a duty and privilege to modify this expression of his, or withdraw it entirely. Will he not do it for truth's sake, and the honor of God?

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Affirmative by C. F. Hudson.

Dear Examiner:—My last closed with Acts 7: 59. The next passage in my list is—

1 Cor. 15: 17, 18. This is the passage which, I said, is claimed on both sides in this question. And it is claimed by my opponents upon what seems to me a marvelous misapprehension of Paul's hypothetical reasoning. IF Christ be not raised, says Paul, THEN they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. And hereupon, Mr. Ham asks, "How have they perished?" ("Man in death," chap. vi.) Why, my dear friend Ham, that deceased Christians have not perished is the very thing that Paul proposes to prove. There would be no hope in their case if Christ had not risen. But Christ HAS risen. What then? THEREFORE they have not perished, is what every Corinthian child must infer. And this hypothetical mode of stating a case is well known among logicians, as one of the most conclusive methods of argument. "Except those days should be shortened," said Christ, "there should no flesh be saved." And even if Christ had not added another word, every one would confidently infer that some flesh will be saved.

In the same way, when Bro. Storrs remarks, "IF there be no resurrection, then, at death, man *ceases to have existence*, and will live no more forever," ["Intermediate state," page 20,]—we can only infer, that at death man does *not* cease to have existence, for there *is* a resurrection. But the body has perished, as Mr. Ham admits. "Surely," he says, "Paul could not have meant by this expression mere *dead bodies!* Dead bodies are not they which have fallen asleep in Christ." Hence, we are forced to conclude, that Christians, at least, have souls that can survive their bodies, awaiting the resurrection. If they have not such souls, then they have actually perished, and a resurrection of one who has perished is absurd.

2 Cor. 5: 4. "Not for that we would be unclothed." Here and in the context, the body seems to be spoken of as the tabernacle or vesture of the soul. In the interim, between death and the resurrection, the soul is untented and unclad; which could not be, if it had no separate existence. Some interesting facts, that have nothing to do with our modern "spiritual manifestations," but which do seem to indicate the precise advantages of *embodiment* to the soul, I reserve for a future letter.

2 Cor. 12: 2. "Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth." But my good friends would have told Paul at once, that this could not have been out of his body, for aside from his body he could not have existed. Paul's doubt is a marked dissent from their theory.

1 Thes. 5: 23. Did the preservation of the "spirit and soul," depend, either physically or morally, on the preservation of the "body," until Christ's coming? Now if the soul cannot exist without the body, the physical dependence must have been utter and complete. And as for the moral dependence, I should shrink from a combat with the materialist, upon the theory held by my good friends. I must leave that point of courage to "Anthropos," who is so ready to carry out the doctrines of Phrenology consistently, and fearless of all consequences. (See his "Unity of Man," page 26.) For my own part, I recognize the facts of Anthropology as an important half of truth, relating to our compound being. But I cannot take any mere Natural History of Man as the rational basis or rule of truth, or as defining the Future History of Man, until Gal. 5: 17, and several like passages are expunged, and certain facts of consciousness are forgotten.

Heb. 12: 23. Are not the "spirits of just men made perfect" by passing from the "unclothed" state to that in which they are "clothed upon"

with immortality? What need of supposing, as my friends must suppose, that these spirits are perfected by passing from a state of temporary non-existence?

1 Pet. 3 : 19. Are the "spirits in prison" embodied? What is meant by the "preaching," or rather "heralding" here spoken of, is no part of our argument. If the spirits of the just are intended, Heb. 12 : 23 and 2 Cor. 5 : 4, are parallel passages. If the spirits of the unjust then I must refer to 2 Pet. 2 : 9, and ask, Does God reserve [Gk. *Terein*, to keep watch of; to hold in custody] the unjust in non-existence until the judgment?

Rev. 6 : 9. Here I need only remark that the souls of martyrs are spoken of *just as if* they had survived their bodies, and had now a separate and actual existence before the resurrection. See v. 11. The force of the passage can be evaded, it seems to me, only by quoting those hyperboles in which God is said to employ "things that are not" to bring to nought things that are, and the like.

I have now gone over the first list of passages which I gave in the Examiner for July 1. The reader will judge whether they prove that the soul is a distinct entity, capable of a separate or disembodied existence. I might adduce other Scriptural proofs, but need not do so at present. Upon the second list of passages it behooves me not to comment until the list shall have been accepted or corrected by Br. Grew.

Hoping to pursue this discussion in due time, in its rational, historical, and practical bearings, I am yours in the love of Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs:—On 1 Cor. 15 : 17, 18, Br. Hudson remarks, "Why, my dear friend Ham, that deceased Christians have not perished, is the very thing that Paul proposes to prove." "Christ has risen—THEREFORE they have not perished, is what every Corinthian child must infer." This is true; but the question is, does the apostle's declaration imply that the dead had not perished *at all*, or that they had not perished *forever?* What is the argument of the inspired writer? Is it that dead Christians had not perished, because they "have souls that can survive their bodies?" Not a word of this. I ask Br. H. candidly to consider, ought not this to have been, and would not this have been the argument of the apostle, if such was the fact? But he predicates this blessed hope, that the dead saints had not perished for ever, on the fact of Christ's resurrection, and the consequent resurrection of his saints. He became "the first fruits of them which slept," by his own resurrection.

The representation is, yea, the positive plain declaration, not that *man* survived the dissolution of an outward material tenement, but that THE MEN, the "*brethren*," v. 6, "they," *the persons*, had fallen asleep in death; v. 18. Now, instead of relying altogether on the fact of the resurrection, to prove that they had not perished for ever, if Br. H. is correct, such an argument would have been entirely inappropriate and superfluous. If their souls "survive their bodies," the apostle had only to declare the fact to prove that the saints had not perished. There was no need to refer to any resurrection. *Man* had not died; he had only escaped as a bird from a cage. Suppose a man to strike the bird-cage and break it to pieces. The bird flies away. Who, in his senses, would argue that the bird had not perished, because the cage could be mended? The entire argument, throughout the glorious chapter is adverse to the popular sentiment, and in perfect harmony with the declaration of the inspired psalmist, That in the day of death the "thoughts (of man) perish;" which Br. H.'s views deny. The resurrection of men, who have temporarily perished in death, involves no absurdity, and is perfectly competent for the Almighty to accomplish, who of stones can raise up children to Abraham.

2 Cor. 5 : 4, "Not for that we would be unclothed." "Here," Br. H. remarks, "the body seems to be spoken of as the tabernacle or vesture of the soul." The passages teaches that in death, men (*we*) not a part of men, or of *us*, are unclothed of *something;* but that an immortal soul is unclothed of anything is a mere assumption. Br. H. must prove by the divine testimony that man possesses such a soul. The unclothing—according to fact and Scripture testimony, that man's thoughts, knowledge and affections perish at death—must refer to the cessation of life and all these powers. The context requires this construction. "Not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of LIFE." His desire was not to be unclothed of life, but to be clothed upon with immortal life. Now, it is undeniable that the apostle had his mind *on the resurrection*, and not on any intermediate state of felicity for a surviving soul. He clearly teaches that it is at the resurrection, and not before, that mortality will be swallowed up of life. See 1 Cor. 15 : 54; and this was the object of his desire. If Br. H. is correct, he should have desired to be unclothed that he might "*immediataly* enter into glory," or, if it is said, that he meant, he did not desire the pains of death, by the expression of being unclothed; still he ought to have expressed his desire of the felicity which, according to Br. H., immediately follows. His desire was for that for

which God had "wrought" the saints, v. 5, which was, "that mortality might be swallowed of life," v. 4; *i. e.*, by the resurrected body or house from heaven, v. 2. Until that period, the apostle, so far from expecting felicity, represents the saints as *groaning*, "waiting," not for happiness *at death*, but "for the adoption, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY;" Rom. 8: 23. This plainly proves that when he desired to depart and be with Christ, it was, that he might be with him at his coming at the resurrection. Our dear Lord plainly teaches, John 14: 3, that we shall not be with him until he comes again. See also Col. 3: 4.

2 Cor. 12: 2. This refers to a miraculous vision, the *modus* of which the apostle could not define. To adduce such a passage in opposition to plain scriptural declarations, is totally inadmissible. But our opponents ask, "Does not the passage imply, necessarily, that the apostle supposed that there might be such a thing or state as being out of the body?" Certainly it does imply that he supposed that he might have been out of the body *in some sense*. There is, however, no necessity for supposing that a distinct entity, called the soul, was separated from the body. He might mean that he did not know whether he was caught up bodily, or whether it was a mere mental vision.

1 Thess. 5: 23. In reply to our brother's question on the passage, I remark that, in manifest opposition to his theory, the apostle represents the perfection of spirit, soul, and body to be inseparably connected. There is not the least intimation that the spirit or soul would be perfected before the body, nor any thing which warrants an idea that they are not mutually dependent. If we understand, with some, that the pious prayer refers to our perfection in the present state, body, soul, and spirit are connected. I apprehend, however, that the reference is to our perfection *at* "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Gal. 5: 17, needs no expunging for us. It implies no immortal soul, or any essence, distinct from the material organism capable of surviving it. It simply represents the warfare of the same mind which is sometimes fleshly or carnal, and sometimes spiritual or holy. Thus in connection with this very passage, the works of the flesh are declared to be "envyings, emulations," &c., which are exercises of the mind, in connection with the physical organism. As for "certain facts of consciousness," referred to by our brother, we ask him to explain. We are conscious of possessing knowledge, thought, and affections, but not of immortal existence, or of any distinct entity independent of the body. Our friend's view of this subject is a matter of belief, not of consciousness. Whether his faith is true or false, must be determined by the oracles of God.

Heb. 12: 23. I do not certainly know whether our brother means that we are clothed upon with immortality at death, or at the resurrection. If the latter, as it rather appears, then the departed are not *now* perfect, and, consequently, the passage affords no proof of their present conscious existence. I reply in the affirmative to his question. They are made perfect by passing from the unclothed state (*i. e.*, unclothed of all vitality, thought, affection, &c., as the Scriptures plainly declare them to be in the hour of death,) to that in which they are clothed upon with immortality.—Our "need of supposing" this, is the word which abideth for ever. The evidence that "the spirits of just men" are not made perfect until the resurrection, is so clear that even the advocates of a conscious intermediate state admit it. Mr. G. Campbell, who believed *sheol*, or *hades*, to be a state of consciousness, admits it as being a state of "silence" and "darkness;" and "that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad." If they are conscious so far from being perfect, they must be groaning, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies," Rom. 8: 23. Paul never dreamed of perfection until immortality is put on at the resurrection. Phil. 3d chap. he plainly teaches that he would not be perfect until he should "attain unto the resurrection of the dead." This was the glorious fact for which he was "apprehended of Christ Jesus," and the prize for which he labored.

In this passage and its connection the apostle is contrasting the old and new covenants, the Mosaic and Christian dispensations. In the 23d v. he opens before the believer the higher privileges and blessings, to which the better and everlasting covenant entitles him, at the coming of the Lord Jesus; the glories which will be revealed in the saints at his coming. His meaning is, that we are come, by faith in Christ, into that state where we shall ultimately possess the blessings enumerated in vs. 22, 23, 24. The things are yet future.—"The general assembly and church of the first-born," consists of the entire elect of God, the whole family of the redeemed. The family is not yet complete. We are not yet come to it. When the Son of man shall come in his glory with his holy angels, and not before, we shall actually come "to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant,"

and "to the innumerable company of angels:"—Then we shall come "to Mount Zion, the city of the living God." "The pure in heart shall see God," the Judge of all. His tabernacle shall be with men, and he will dwell among them and be their God. Then we shall associate with all the spirits of just men made perfect. The whole family of the redemmed are to be perfected, and presented *together* as a chaste bride unto Jesus Christ: Eph. 5 : 27. This presentation, is not at death, but at the resurrection: 2 Cor. 4 : 14; Jude 24. It is then our Lord will come in his glory. Many indeed have died in faith, but "received not the promise," *i. e.*, have not yet received the great promise of the gospel, which is eternal life; 1 John 2 : 25; "that they without us should not be made perfect;" Heb. 11 : 40.

1 Pet. 3 : 19. "Spirits in prison," Milton says, "literally, *in guard*, or as the Syriac version renders it, *in sepulchers, in the grave.*" The Spirit of Christ in Noah, preached to those who were in the grave when Peter wrote. 2 Peter 2 : 5.—By the term spirits, I understand the persons, as the term souls must be understood Acts 27 : 37. Ps. 33 : 19. So the word "bodies" must be understood, Rom. 12 : 1, as including the entire person.

To the question on 2 Peter 2 : 9 : I reply, the Lord knoweth how—to reserve the unjust (in the grave) to the day of judgment to be punished.

Rev. 6 : 9. It would be absurd to give this passage a literal construction. No one can suppose that the souls of the departed are under an altar in heaven. The blood is the life. In the sacrifices under the law it was poured under the altar. As the blood of Abel cried from the ground for revenge, so the blood of the martyrs cries for vengeance against their persecutors.

In the passages our brother has thus far adduced, I find nothing really inconsistent with the plain declarations of the eternal Spirit that "the dead know not anything," and that "in that very day (the) thoughts perish."

Yours for the truth,

HENRY GREW.

A SHORT DIALOGUE.

L. You ask, in reference to the sentence 'Thou shalt surely die,' 'What part of the man is excepted in this denunciation?' I ask, in turn, what part of the man is excepted from this, 'DUST THOU ART AND UNTO DUST THOU SHALT RETURN?' If you say NONE, then I will leave you to settle it with God's word, which says, 'The spirit returns to God who gave it.' If you say the spirit is excepted; then I reply, so it is excepted from such a death as the body meets."

S. It by no means follows, if the spirit is excepted from returning to dust, that therefore it does not come under the threatening of death, even such a death as the body meets. The Psalmist says, Psa. 8 : 6, "Thou hast put all things under his feet:" but Paul after quoting this language, 1 Cor. 15 : 27, adds—"But it is *manifest* that *he is excepted* that did put all things under him." So I say—when God said, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," it is *manifest* that the breath, which made man a *living* being, is excepted. But when God said to the living soul, "In dying thou shalt die," it is *not* manifest that any part is excepted.

L. "Do not evade the point, Br. S.; if the whole man is meant in one case, it is in the other."

S. That is a *mere assumption.* I have shown, and you admit, that the breath or spirit cannot return to dust, and therefore, it is manifest, it is excepted in that denunciation on man. But you have not shown, to my mind, and it is very far from being *manifest* that any part of man was excepted from the penalty of death. And, in my judgment, unless you can show, that what you call the spirit had an independent existence before man stood up a living soul, you can never demonstrate that it will have an independent existence after it leaves the body.

L. "You say death is the PENALTY on the whole man; that death is unconsciousness, utter unconsciousness. Yet unhappiness is a CONSEQUENCE of sin. Can unconsciousness be unhappy? Who most effectually evades the punishment or penalty those who say death separates the spirit from the body, and one returns to God, to be unhappy, and leaves the other in the dust?—or those who say both go to dust and sleep, and evade all unhappiness, the 'CONSEQUENCE of sin?'"

S. To the *whole man*, God said:—"Thou shalt surely die." Or, as the margin reads, '*Dying* THOU *shalt die.*' What part of man is excepted in this denunciation? surely no part. To say, the *mind*, which was principal in the offence, was exempt from death, is an absurdity; or, to make its death to be no more than a state of unhappiness, in my judgmant, is doing violence to the testimony of God. That unhappiness was involved, as a consequence of sin, is admitted; but, that that was *the penalty* for transgression is denied. The penalty is *death.*

Now, let me show your sophistry. The law of man says—If thou kill thy neighbor thou shalt die—That is, says the expositor of the law, He

shall be kept in misery. "No," I reply, "to make death no more than a state of misery, or unhappiness, is doing violence to the law. That unhappiness is involved as a consequence of murder, is admitted, but that that is the *penalty* for murder is denied." The Expositor replies—"You say death is the penalty: that death is unconsciousness. Yet unhappiness is a *consequence of murder*. Can *unconsciousness* be unhappy?" I answer, NO; but a *murderer* can be unhappy, and his unhappiness is not removed by knowing he must die.—Had you, Br. L., put your question fairly, viz., "Can" a *sinner* "be unhappy?" you would not have blinded your own eyes nor the eyes of others. Cannot a sinner be unhappy before the penalty is executed upon him? And is it a small ingredient in his unhappiness that he is to die? be cut off from all hope of life and eternal enjoyment?

If the soul is a distinct being, or existence, residing in the body, and capable of living out of the body, then how does it get into the body?

L. If you will tell me how the soul of the widow's son, I Kings 17: 21, 22, come into him, I will answer your question?"

S. As you try to make much of this case, I will call attention to the fact, that the Hebrew term *nephesh*, translated *soul*, admits of the following renderings, viz: *mind*, *soul*, *breath*, *life*. Our translators have rendered it in all these ways. You fix upon a *word* which has these various significations to prove that there is something in man that exists in consciousness when the man is dead. I think your question is easily answered. The child's soul [breath] came into him just as it came into Adam. The Lord God breathed into his *nostrils* the *breath* of life. And you might just as well infer that Adam's soul had consciousness and existed out of him, before it came into him, as that this child's soul did, from any thing that appears in the text or context.

L. "But I will now tell you where it" [the soul] "comes from. It comes from God, and returns to God who gave it. Eccl. 12: 7."

S. That is the *spirit*, brother; the Hebrew word for which is *ruach*, not *nephesh*, as above. But will you say the soul and spirit are the same thing? You must, to make your statement good for any thing. If they are the same thing, Paul has made a very unnecessary distinction in saying, "your whole *spirit* and *soul* and *body*." 1 Thess. 5: 23. If they are not the same thing, your quoting Eccel. 12: 7, entirely fails you—it does not prove that the *soul* goes to God at death.

THE TRUE POSITION OF A CHURCH.

We have been requested to say something about church order, &c. We offer the following remarks on the subject, on our individual responsibility.

1. DECLARATION.

All *authoritative* Creeds, Declaration of Sentiments, or Confessions of Faith, as well as Disciplines of human construction, are unwarrantable assumptions of authority over the body of Christ, and should be resisted as an invasion of personal rights and personal accountability; yet a *Church of God* may know, and ought to know, what ground it occupies.

2. STANDARD OF FAITH AND PRACTICE.

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are the *only* and *sufficient rule* both of Faith and Practice; and each Member of the Church of God has the right to interpret the same according to his personal understanding of what they teach, without liability to censure for so doing, he being responsible to God alone for his faith.

3. GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH.

Jesus Christ, by the appointment of the Father, is "Head over all things to the Church;" therefore no other authority to *legislate* for that body is to be acknowledged. The Members of the Church have authority, in the government thereof, only to *execute* the laws of its Head, and are all equally bound to see this faithfully attended to.—In this view, the body is Congregational in its government; and the church assembling in one place is bound to execute the laws of its Head in that place, without the interference of churches in other places.

4. TEST OF FELLOWSHIP.

No other test is to be used, in receiving to Fellowship, than that the person give evidence that Christ has received him; or that the individual is in a state of reconciliation to God, and is thereby of "the Lord added to the Church." Such persons are entitled to continued fellowship so long as their tempers and practices are in agreement with the precepts of the Head of the Church.

It will be seen by the foregoing that it is not so much the having creeds, &c., that we object to, as it is making them a *test* of Fellowship or Membership. All persons have a system of belief, or their view of what the Bible teaches, whether it is written or unwritten—this is unavoidable: but Christianity requires that we should not separate persons from us, nor suffer them to be separated, by authoritatively assuming that a belief in *our* inter-

pretation of Scripture is essential to salvation, or necessary to Christian fellowship and union.

Such we believe to be the true position of the Church, and any other view seems to us irreconcilable with our Lord's prayer, that his followers might *all be one* Not to be one is to be "carnal."

We mean by the term "*carnal*" the same that we understand the Apostle to mean in 1 Cor. 3 : 1, 3, 4; i. e., the opposite to spiritual. "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife, and *divisions*, are ye not *carnal*, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am *of Paul*, and another, I am *of Apollos*, are ye not carnal?" Is not the spirit that *divides* the church of God at the present day precisely the same as that here condemned by the Apostle?—For while one says, I am a Methodist, and another, I am a Baptist; and another, I am an Episcopalian; and another, I am an Adventist; and so on, to the end of the sectarian *divisions*, "are ye not carnal, and walk as men" of the world, who divide into parties for purposes of ambition, power, or worldly gain? It seems, to our mind, clear that this is the very spirit which the Apostle condemns, and pronounces a *carnal* disposition. And what is it perpetuates these divisions but the *authoritative* creeds, confessions of faith, and disciplines of human invention? Let them be destroyed, utterly, and the sectarian divisions of the church of God would cease as a matter of course, and no other distinction would be known in that church, except that of *location*. These divisions are *sinful* and opposed to the authority of Christ, and stand in the way of the answer of his most fervent and agonizing prayer for his follows, John 17 : 11, 21–23 verses, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be ONE, *as we are*. That they *all* may be *one: as* thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be ONE, EVEN *as we are one;* I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made PERFECT IN ONE," &c. What can we think of a *plea* for the sectarian divisions, that have *scattered* the church of God, with this most affecting prayer before us? And what is it keeps up these divisions but the *creeds*, &c., which we call *carnal?*

We have many more texts of Scripture against these divisions. Let us call attention to a few of them. 1 Cor. 10 : 17. "For we being many are *one body;*" and 12 : 12, 13. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into ONE BODY." Eph. 4 : 4. "There is *one* body;" also, Col. 3 : 14, 15. "Above all these things put on *charity*, which is the BOND of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called IN ONE BODY," &c. How is the bond of perfectness to make the children of God one body so long as sectarian partizans keep up their bands of discord, *test creeds?* The question is not, Is the man a child of God? or, at least, this is only a secondary question; but, "is he a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian?" and so on: and he is judged of, and treated, not according to his relationship to God, but according to his relationship to a particular creed of a sect or party: he is then embraced or slighted as it shall appear he is of our sect or of another; and, his Christian character comes not into the account, in our feelings, on the first knowledge we have of the man! Can here be *oneness?* What makes the discord? *Test creeds—"carnal" arrangements.* Who will show us one text in the Bible *against* the church of God being ONE?

We call those associated together, *the church of God*, not because every child of God is associated with them in the place, but because having renounced authoritative *creeds* they are without a name of man's invention, and the Scriptures apply the name "church of God" to the children of God in any particular place, as, also, to the church universal. See 1 Cor. 1 : 2. "The *church of God* which is at Corinth;" and 10 : 32. "Give none offence to the *church of God;*" and 11 : 22. "Despise ye the *church of God?*" also, 15 : 9. "I persecuted *the church of God.*" Acts 20 : 28. "Feed the *church of God.*" 2 Cor. 1 : 1. "The *church of God* which is at Corinth." Gal. 1 : 13. "Beyond measure I persecuted the *church of God.*" 1 Tim. 3 : 5. "How shall he take care of the *church of God.*" And lastly, the Apostle uses the plural, and says, 1 Thess. 2 : 14, "Ye became the followers of the *churches of God.*" Thus we find the most common appellation given to the church was the CHURCH OF GOD, for this evident reason, it belongs to him. If it belonged to the Methodists, it would be proper to call it the Methodist Church; or if it belonged to the Baptists, it would be proper to call it the Baptist Church; and so with respect to all other names, which make us lose sight of the fact that the true church belongs not to man but to God: and is not distinguished as such except by following Christ, or *imitating* him.

But as the church of God belongs not to any of the sects, as such, nor to any man, or body of men, it is manifestly improper to call it by any name which is calculated to foster divisions; and, in our opinion, all such appellations, voluntarily accepted, and used, by a body professing to be a church, are a renunciation of their connection with the church of God. We, therefore, call them just what they call themselves, viz.: Baptist church, Methodist church, Presbyterian church, &c. They, evidently, feel it more important to be thus designated than to be simply *the church of God:* and they receive persons into their fellowship, in their churches, not because the applicant is a follower of Christ, but because he is a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, &c. We do not say they would receive him if they knew the individual *was not* a Christian; but that is not *the* reason why they receive him; he must give them evidence not only that he has given his heart to God, but that he is sound in their creed, or discipline, or whatever it may be that *divides* them from other professing christians: nor does it help those sectarian churches at all, who profess to keep "open communion," inviting "all persons in regular standing in other churches" to commune with them. Look at it. You offer yourself, for example, to the Presbyterian church; you are rejected, because you find some one article in their creed, to which you cannot consent. You now unite with the Methodist church. Next Lord's day you are at the meeting of the Presbyterians and it is "communion:" they invite you, being a "member in regular standing in another church," to *commune* with them! They would not receive you into their church, though they admit you are a christian brother by inviting you to their communion! Is it not thus evident that these sectarian churches have set up a standard or *test* of membership in *their bodies*, which they admit, by their invitations to communion, to be above the standard that God has given?

MORE "INFIDELS."—We clip the following from the *Philadelphia Ledger*. It speaks for itself. The spirit of intolerance—which calls men *infidels* who cannot assent to human authority issuing from the dark and corrupt ages of Christianity—stands out in all its hateful habiliments in this transaction.

"Rev. F. M. Haygood was recently put on trial, found guilty of heresy, and expelled from the Baptist Church in Marietta, Ga., because he would neither assert nor deny that *God foreknew all things*. The Rev. gentleman said in his defence that he could find no passage in Scripture which taught the doctrine, and he had no opinion therefore on the subject."

BISHOP NEWTON, in his Works, "*Dissertation No. 60, On the final state of Man,*" speaks as follows:—

"*It is impossible for any creature to live in eternal torments.* Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings? Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. 'God is love,' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing, delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine it you may, but you can never seriously believe it,* nor reconcile it to God and goodness. God could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting."

"FRUITS AND FARINACEA *the Proper Food for Man;* Being an attempt to prove from history, anatomy, physiology, and chemistry, that the Original, Natural, and Best Diet of Man is derived from the Vegetable Kingdom. By JOHN SMITH. With notes and illustrations, by R. T. Trall, M.D. From the Second London Edition. *Fowlers & Wells,* Publishers, New York."

The title of the work sufficiently indicates its importance. We have received only "Part II," from page 97 to 192; and would be pleased to see the entire work.

"THE PAULINE CHART."—We have received a copy of this *Chart* from the author—J. W. BONHAM. It is a chart of the "Travels and Voyages of the Apostle Paul," having a small map of all the countries embraced; then arranged in columns are the Places Visited—Localities of those places—the year of the visit—Principal Occurrences—References to various works from which information is derived; so that the whole history is spread out before the eye at a glance. For those who wish to study the subject in a connected manner it will be found a help. It is got up very neatly. To be had of the author, Newton Centre, Mass.

PROF. MATTISON has not furnished an article for this number. We trust he will for the next.

The question under discussion is one of deep interest, and many are anxious that it should go on till it is settled. There is a heaven-wide difference between a *theological soul* and a Bible one.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1854. NO. 16.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

The Hidden Manna.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM.

The 'Bread of Life!' the saints' real nutriment,
By which, as by the life-imparting fruit,
Their moral natures grow and gather health,—
Not of that earthly sort, which feels decline,
And fades away in death,—but that which, like
The 'Living Water' of the living fount,
Springs upwards 'into Everlasting Life.'

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Hidden Manna." Such was the gracious encouragement which John was commanded to send, in his heaven-indited epistle, to the martyr church at Pergamos. That primitive society of the apostolical age had been called to pass through the fires of a sanguinary persecution, and, like their Lord, to take up the cross in its most self-denying form; and the words just cited were designed to comfort and strengthen them in the endurance of these afflictions. No doubt they were eminently adapted to this end, and that they ministered just that kind of consolation which the necessities of the suffering church required. "The Hidden Manna!' what are we to understand by this metaphoric language? The word "Manna" at once suggests that our text has a historic reference, and our minds revert to the period of Israel's journeyings for forty years in the wilderness, where they were miraculously sustained by "Manna,"—a preternatural kind of bread. But for this extraordinary method of sustaining the Hebrews in the wilderness, they must have all perished.

To this memorable circumstance our Lord alluded, in his reply to the multitude, whom he had miraculously fed in the desert, and who had followed him to Capernaum, whither he had proceeded after the events of that extraordinary evening. The sight of the approaching multitude, who, he knew, had followed him from mere sordid and selfish motives, excited our Lord's displeasure, and induced him openly to rebuke and admonish them. Smarting under the exposure of their motives, they arrogantly challenge his credentials. What dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written, "He gave them bread from heaven to eat." With strange infatuation they seem to have forgotten that they too, only a few hours before, had eaten miraculous bread in the desert, supplied by him of whom they now rudely demand—'What dost thou work?' Without commenting on this lamentable infatuation, Jesus merely replied—"Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not *that bread* from heaven; but my Father giveth you the *true bread* from heaven. For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. . . . I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. I am the living bread which came down from Heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever." The analogy between Christ as the bread from heaven for the nourishment and everlasting life of the world, and the manna of the wilderness for the preservation of the Israelites from death, is very apparent. As the Israelites in the desert would have died but for the manna, so mankind will perish in the eternal destruction of death if they have no hope in Christ,—the Resurrection and the Life of men.

Christ, then, is the heavenly manna or bread from heaven, because the life of mankind, as an everlasting possession, is in his hands, and is bestowed by him. "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." "My sheep hear my voice, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." "I am the resurrection and the life." "I am that bread of life." The promise then of "hidden manna," to a martyr church, was pre-eminently suitable, for it told them in a beautifully expressive figure, that the lives which their fidelity should induce them to lay down for Christ, would not be finally and for ever forfeited, for they served one who could say, "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever;" and "because I live, ye shall live also."

So far we have ascertained the probable meaning of the word "manna," but we have yet to explain the force of the adjective "hidden"—"the hidden manna."

There is a Jewish tradition, which some have imagined will explain this figure. It is said that Jeremiah, a short time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, hid the ark of the testimony and its contents with some other sacred apparatus in a cave in Mount Sinai, and that they will be brought out again in the days of their Messiah. (See 2 Maccabeus, i. 8.) Of course this is a mere fabulous legend, and cannot be reasonably supposed to be the circumstance hinted at in the figure under consideration.

Another explanation has been suggested by the fact, that the memorial pot of manna was laid up in the secrecy of the ark, and that it is called "hidden," for this reason. But this explanation

overlooks the important fact, that the manna was kept in the ark not for secrecy, but for frequent exposure before the people, as a memento of the memorable preservation in the wilderness. Had the manna been "hidden" in the ark, it would have defeated the object contemplated, by putting aside some to be miraculously preserved as a memorial. See Exodus xvi. 32–34.

It has been further suggested that the word "hidden" is to be understood of those secret supplies of strength and grace which Christ ministers to his militant people. in their earthly probation. But this is evidently not the explanation, for the "hidden manna," here spoken of, is not given to believers during their earthly pilgrimage, but as a future reward at the close of that pilgrimage. "To him that *overcometh*," which is obviously at the *end*, and not in the progress of their course.

A passage in Paul's writings seems to supply the true explanation. "For ye are dead, and your *life* is *hid* with Christ in God. When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."—Col. iii. 3, 4. Here the Christian's life is said to be *hid with Christ;* and Paul calls Christ "our life." Christ, too, says, "*I* am . . . the life;" and in a figure, "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you.* Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, *hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*" The life of the christian is in the hands and power of Christ. Man has no life beyond the temporary life he now possesses. If he would live for ever, he must be united to Christ. Union with Christ, by the bonds of genuine piety, establishes a title, by grace, to eternal life, which is bestowed as a gift or reward of grace through Christ.—Rom. vi. 23. And this gift of eternal life is bestowed by Christ, on the occasion of his second appearing, as "the resurrection and the life." Until his second advent, the lives of all his slumbering saints are in his hands, "hidden" in the mysterious secrecy of his great power. The exercise of that power, when he shall call upon his beloved dead to arise, will be the *revelation* of their, at present, "*hidden*" life. "Ye are dead, and *your life is hid* with Christ in God. When Christ, who is *our life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Well might the church at Pergamos be consoled, amidst its martyrdoms, with the promise, "To him that overcometh," or endureth to the end, "will I give to eat of the Hidden Manna." Who will not rejoice in this assurance as a promise made, not to one church only, but to the universal church of the faithful, and renouncing the presumptuous claim to an immortality, apart from Christ, exclaim, "Lord evermore give us this bread!" Believe it, christian, that you are dead, a mere mortal creature in yourself, destitute of any power of life beyond that ye now command in your momentary consciousness. Rob not Christ of this grand distinction as "the quickening spirit," but rejoicing in him as *your* "life," ascribe to him the glory of your redemption from *mortality*, as well as from sin, and with the divinely taught Peter, say, "Lord, to whom shall we go, thou hast the words of eternal life."

SPIRIT:

Or, the Hebrew Terms "Ruach" and "Neshamah," and the Greek Term "Pneuma."

by rev. wm. glen moncrieff, scotland.

[Continued from p. 227.]

Pneuma.—*Greek Term.*

Sec. I. Pneuma is a noun: the verb is *pneo*, to breathe, to blow.

Sec. II. Pneuma is rendered *wind* and *breath*.

1. *Wind.* John 3: 8, "The wind (pneuma) bloweth where it listeth."

Under this head, as we judge, ought to be introduced the passage—Heb. 1: 7, "who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." This verse is rendered as follows by Moses Stewart, in his work on the Hebrews, "who maketh his angels winds, and his ministering servants flaming fire;" i. e., he adds, "who maketh his angels that serve him the ministers of his will, as the winds and the lightning are" . . . "The whole phrase is susceptible of another interpretation," observes the same commentator, "viz., who making his angels winds, i .e. swift as the winds, and his servants lightning, i. e. rapid, or terrible, or resistless as the lightning. But this does not suit the design for which the apostle quotes it, so well as the first interpretation. His object is to show that the angels are employed simply in a *ministerial* capacity; while the Son is *Lord* of all. Our English version, which has rendered *ruchoth* (Ps. 104: 4) by spirits, gives an erroneous view of the meaning of the original."

2. *Breath.* James 2: 26, "The body without the spirit (pneuma, margin "*breath*") is dead. Rev. 13: 15, "he had power to give life (pneuma, margin "*breath*") unto the image of the beast."

Sec. III. Pneuma is rendered *life*.

Rev. 13: 15, "He had power to give life (pneuma) unto the image of the beast.'

Life results from breathing, hence to give *pneuma*, or to cause a being to breathe, is to impart life to it. In this case our translators have put the effect, *life*, for its secondary cause, *breath*.

Sec. IV. Pneuma is rendered *ghost*.

Matt. 27: 50, "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost" (pneuma), or "expired." Rob. Lex. pneuma 2d. See also, Mark 15: 37. John 18: 30, "he said, it is finished: and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost" (pneuma).

These two passages are quoted, besides others, by Robinson in his Lexicon, under *pneuma* 2d, as examples of the use of the term *pneuma*, importing "the principle of life residing in the breath, breathed into man from God and again returning to God; compare Gen. 2: 7, Eccles. 12: 7, Ps. 104: 29." After all "the principle of life residing in the breath" is not a very clear expression. Why not say, *pneuma* in these passages designates life? He yielded up the ghost—the spirit—the spirit of life—or simply, life; i. e. he died. *Pneuma* is translated "*life*" in Rev. 13: 15; see the immediate preceding section.

Parallel to these verses is Luke 23 : 46, "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit (pneuma); and having said thus, he gave up the ghost," literally, breathed-out, expired, or died.

This, according to Robinson, is another verse illustrative of *pneuma* as designating "the principle of life residing in the breath;" or, as we would say, life itself, which is the result of breathing. Our blessed Lord gave up his life for men, and on the cross he said "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit," meaning the spirit of life he had, or simply life itself; having said so, we are told, he breathed out, or life ceased.

The following passages from the Old Testament are quite parallel to those just explained, and no one finds any difficulty in understanding them. "And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into his bed, and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people," Gen. 49 : 33. "Oh that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me : I should have been as though I *had not been*," Job 10 : 18, 19, "Man dieth and wasteth away : yea man giveth up the ghost (*expireth*) and where is he?" Job 14 : 10. "She hath given up the ghost; her sun is gone down while it was yet day," Jer. 15 : 9.

SEC. V. PNEUMA, as already shown, is translated *spirit*. The English word spirit, we may observe, comes from the latin word *spiro*, to breathe; its radical force may be seen in the following compound English terms, inspiration, or in-breathing; expiration, or out-breathing. We will classify, so far as possible, the different modes in which this term is employed; and as far as these usages bear upon the object we have before us in this treatise, which is simply to determine what is meant by the spirit of man.

"*Spirit*" imports,

1st. The spirit, or breath of life; perhaps the idea will be more accurately presented thus—it imports the complex idea of breathing and so living; breath, and its result, life.

Of this usage a specimen was introduced at the close of last section, which may be here only referred to; it is Luke 23 : 46. In addition to it we may now note,

Luke 8 : 55, "and her spirit, (pneuma) came again, and she arose straightway:" she breathed anew and life was rekindled. This is another text exemplifying what Robinson calls "the principle of life residing in the breath."

Acts. 7 : 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (pneuma).

This, according to Robinson, is another example of *pneuma* importing "the principle of life residing in the breath." Indeed the martyr just called upon his Lord to receive back the life-giving breath, or to receive his life which he cheerfully rendered up as a sacrifice on the altar of Christianity. Alas! but this "spirit" has actually been turned into the man Stephen himself; and yet surely the narrative is plain. He cried "Lord Jesus receive my spirit."—and did he go away to glory? as a spirit did he wing his flight to the Redeemer's presence? No; "He kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, Lord lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, HE FELL ASLEEP."—The man, who was "*but* flesh," having the spirit of life in him, fell asleep. The spirit was not the man: Stephen and the *pneuma* he had were very different. *He* was stoned, it vanished; *he* returned to the dust, it returned to the charge of the universal Proprietor.

Dr. John Brown in his recent work, "The Dead in Christ," p. 21, says "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," surely cannot mean—let me lose the capacity for many centuries of knowing, loving, and serving thee." On which we would respectfully observe, that if this "spirit" was not necessary to his knowing, loving, and serving Christ, he might part with it and remain as thoughtful and affectionate and loyal as ever; but if it was the spirit of life he had from God, and than this it was neither more nor less, its departure would inevitably number him with the dead, who "know not anything," whose thoughts have perished, till a resurrection takes place by Power Divine. *He* fell asleep, and could he be awake also? *he* was buried, was he also unburied? In the calm sleep of unconsciousness he rests in hope of a revival to immortality.

James 2 : 26, "For as the body without the spirit (pneuma, margin "breath") is dead." Rev. 11 : 11, "After three days and a half the spirit (pneuma) of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet. Compare Gen. 6 : 17, and 7 : 15, 22, 23.

2nd. "*Spirit*," is employed to express *heavy* physical ailment.

Luke 13 : 11, "A woman which had a spirit (pneuma) of infirmity, and was bowed together," &c.

3rd. "*Spirit*" is employed to express some mental quality or state, good or bad.

Matt. 5 : 3, "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (pneumati)—i. e. the lowly in mind. In the parallel verse "spirit" is omitted, "blessed be *ye poor*." Luke 6 : 20. Matt. 26 : 41, "the spirit (pneuma) indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."

"The mind, the *disposition* is ready, and disposed to bear these trials; but *the flesh*, the natural feelings through, the fear of danger, is weak and will be likely to lead you astray when the trial comes."—*Barnes*.

Luke 1 : 17, "The spirit (pneumati) and power of Elias;" i. e. the courage and zeal of Elias. 1 : 80, "The child grew and waxed strong in spirit" (pneumati). "That is, in courage, understanding, and purposes of good, fitting him for his future work."—*Barnes*. 9 : 55, "Ye know not what manner of spirit (pneumatos) ye are of;" "Spirit" here designates temper, or disposition. They misunderstood themselves. 10 : 21, "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit" (pneumati) or greatly rejoiced.

John 4 : 23, "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit (pneumati) and in truth;" i. e. "with a sincere mind, with a true heart, not with mere external rites." Robinson's Lex. *pneuma*, 2 b. Acts. 6 : 10, "The spirit (pneumati) by which he spake;" "Spirit," here means "energy, power, or ardor."—*Barnes*. 18 : 25, "Being fervent in spirit," i. e. exceeding zealous. 20 :

22, "Behold I go bound in the spirit (pneumati) unto Jerusalem;" i. e. with a firm resolution.

Rom. 1: 9, "Whom I serve with my spirit" (pneumati); i. e. with the greatest zeal. 7: 6, "we should serve in newness of spirit" (pneumatos); i. e. "in a new and spiritual manner."—Stuart on Romans. Compare John 4: 23, above. 8: 15, "Ye have not received the spirit (pneuma) of bondage," i. e. the greatest degree of bondage—"again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption," i. e. the greatest degree of filial affection—"whereby we cry abba, Father." See Macknight on the Epistles, Royal Octavo edition, London, 1835, p. 38, 2d col. 11: 8, "God hath given them the spirit (pneuma) of slumber;" i. e. the greatest degree of stupidity. See Macknight as referred to under the preceding text. 12: 11, "fervent in spirit" (pneumati); i. e. exceedingly zealous. Compare Acts 18: 25.

1 Cor. 2: 12, "the spirit, (pneuma) of the world," i. e. the wisdom and knowledge which this world can give;—the learning and philosophy which were so much valued in Greece.—*Barnes.* 4: 21, "Spirit (pneuma) of meekness," i. e. with a great wish and purpose to comfort and commend. 14: 14, "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit (pneuma) prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful"—"my own feelings thus find utterance in prayer, but what I mean is not understood by others." Rob. Lex. *pneuma* 2 b. 15, "I will pray with the spirit (pneuma), and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit (pneuma), and I will sing with the understanding also."

The sense appears to be something like this;—I will pour out my desires in prayer, so as to be understood by others as well as by myself; or I will pour out my feelings, my joy, my love, my homage in praise, so as to be understood by others as well as by myself.

1 Cor. 14: 16, "When thou shalt bless with the spirit (pneuma)" &c.; i. e. bless God with thy mind, but in a language not understood by your fellow-worshippers. 2 Cor. 4: 13, "We having the same spirit (pneuma) of faith" &c. "The general sense here is—"We encounter these perils and afflictions *through the very same principle of faith* (namely, in the resurrection) which David had." *Bloomfield's Greek Test.* Perhaps "the spirit of faith" may require a sense somewhat stronger than that which Bloomfield assigns it, we should rather express it thus,—we having the same well-founded, and vigorous faith.

2 Cor. 7: 1, "Filthiness of the flesh and spirit" (pneumatos). "By filthiness of the spirit (is meant) the pollutions of the *passions*, as shown in the inward workings of sin in the *imagination* and affections."—*Bloomfield.*

Gal. 5: 16, "Walk in the spirit (pneumati), and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh."

"By *pneumati*, most of the older commentators understand the *Holy Spirit.* But, as there is no article, that cannot be admitted. Besides, it is plain, from the words following, and from the opposition between flesh and spirit, at verses 17 and 18, that the sense is what some ancient and many eminent modern expositors suppose, (as Beza, Rambach, Mor., Flatt, and Schott) *the spiritual part of man*, or the *spiritual principle* in man, THEIR REASON AND CONSCIENCE, enlightened by the Gospel, and sustained by the Holy Spirit."—*Bloomfield.* in lo.

Gal. 6: 1, "In the spirit (pneumati) of meekness"—i. e. "with love, and gentleness, and humility, and patience, and with a readiness to forgive when wrong has been done."—*Barnes.* Phil. 1: 27, "Stand fast in one spirit (pneumati), with one mind," i. e. "striving together strenuously for the furtherance of the Gospel."—*Bloomfield.* Eph. 4: 23, "be renewed in the spirit (pneumati) of your mind," i. e. in your understanding, in your affections and dispositions. 1 Tim. 4: 12, "Be thou an example of the believers—in spirit" (pneumati); i. e. "In the government of your *passions*, and in a mild, meek, forgiving disposition."—*Barnes.* 2 Tim. 1: 7, "For God hath not given us the spirit (pneuma) of fear, but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." The sense appears to be, God hath not made us timid, but bold and courageous; affectionate and prudent.

1 Pet. 3: 4, "a meek and quiet spirit" (pneumatos), that is, meekness and quietness.

4th. "*Spirit*" is employed to express the idea of self, or personality.

Mark 2: 8, "Jesus perceived in his spirit" (pneumati); i. e. in himself; or simply, *Jesus perceived.* 8: 12, "He sighed deeply in his spirit" (pneumati), i. e., in himself; or he sighed deeply. Luke 1: 47, "My spirit (pneuma) hath rejoiced," or *I* have rejoiced—"in God my Saviour." This is parallel to the 46 v. "and Mary said, *my soul* doth magnify,"—or I do magnify,—"the Lord." Acts 17: 16, "While Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit (pneuma) was stirred in him," i. e., *he* was greatly moved with distress and pity. Rom. 8: 16, "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit" (pneumati); with our mind, or simply *with us.*

1 Cor. 2: 11, "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit (pneuma) of man which is in him;" or what man knoweth the things of a man save the man himself. Compare Pro. 14: 10, "The heart knoweth his own bitterness;" the same idea might have been expressed in the language before us, from 1 Cor.—the spirit of man which is in him knoweth his own bitterness. Sometimes the formula is "the heart," sometimes "the spirit," but these and all similar modes of expression are invariably to be resolved into the fundamental idea of THE MAN HIMSELF.

1 Cor. 5: 5, "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh," i. e., for his amendment or sanctification; "that the spirit," (pneuma)—the life—the man's life,—or *the man himself*—"may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The same idea may be expressed by another scriptural form;—that his soul—his life—the man himself, may be saved from the second death.

1 Cor. 16: 18, "They have refreshed my spirit (pneuma) and yours;" i. e., refreshed *me* and *you.* 2 Cor. 2: 13, "I had no rest in my spirit (pneu-

mati), or simply, I ha
his spirit," (pneuma)
6: 18, "The grace of
with your spirit" (
you. 2 Tim. 4: 22,
with thy spirit" (pne
[To b

Reasonablene

BY JOHN LO

Redemption Implies t
Lost

It is obvious to an
Testament, that the
consequently of the
supposition of *Adam's*

To understand, the
to by Jesus Christ,
scripture shows we los
worthy of a diligent a
found the *two extreme*
point, either on the o
of all religion, or on
almost nothing. For
all Adam's posterity
punishment for the t
millions had never he
rized to act for him, o
seemed to *others* so lit
or goodness of the gre
thought there was no
consequently that the
mit of it upon a supp
honor and attributes
made Jesus Christ n
preacher of *pure nat*
violence to the whole

And, indeed, both s
trespassed this way
God, by any one who
lection of writings des
tion of the *illiterate b*
salvation; and theref
points, to be understo
ing of the words and
supposed to have had
ers, (who used them a
that time and country
such learned, artificia
as are sought out an
the systems of divini
that each one has bee

To one that thus u
what Adam fell from,
perfect obedience, whic
Testament, (though th
signifies justice, be tra
by this fall he lost pa
lity and the tree of li
immortality.)

The penalty annexe
with the sentence pr
shews this.—The pena
that thou eatest the
How was this execute
day he did eat, he di

mati), or simply, I had no rest. 7 : 13, "Because his spirit," (pneuma) or *he* "was refreshed." Gal. 6 : 18, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit" (pneumatos), or simply, *with you.* 2 Tim. 4 : 22, "The Lord Jesus Christ be with thy spirit" (pneumatos), or *with thee.*

[To be Continued.]

Reasonableness of Christianity.

BY JOHN LOCKE, ESQ.—NO. I.

Redemption Implies the Fall—and by the Fall we Lost Immortality.

It is obvious to any one who reads the New Testament, that the doctrine of *redemption* (and consequently of the gospel) is founded upon the supposition of *Adam's fall.*

To understand, therefore, what we are restored to by Jesus Christ, we must consider what the scripture shows we lost by Adam. This I thought worthy of a diligent and unbiassed search, since I found the *two extremes* that men run into on this point, either on the one hand shook the foundation of all religion, or on the other made Christianity almost nothing. For whilst *some* men would have all Adam's posterity doomed to eternal infinite punishment for the trangression of Adam, whom millions had never heard of, and no one had authorized to act for him, or be his representative; this seemed to *others* so little consistent with the justice or goodness of the great and infinite God, that they thought there was no redemption necessary, and consequently that there *was* none, rather than admit of it upon a supposition so derogatory to the honor and attributes of that infinite being: and so made Jesus Christ nothing but the restorer and preacher of *pure natural religion,* thereby doing violence to the whole tenor of the New Testament.

And, indeed, both sides will be suspected to have trespassed this way against the written word of God, by any one who does but take it to be a collection of writings designed by God for the instruction of the *illiterate bulk of mankind in the way of salvation;* and therefore generally and in necessary points, to be understood in the plain direct meaning of the words and phrases, such as they may be supposed to have had in the mouths of the speakers, (who used them according to the language of that time and country wherein they lived,) without such learned, artificial, and forced senses of them, as are sought out and put upon them in most of the systems of divinity, according to the notions that each one has been bred up in.

To one that thus unbiassed reads the scriptures, what Adam fell from, it is visible, was the state of *perfect obedience,* which is called *justice* in the New Testament, (though the word which in the original signifies justice, be translated righteousness.) And by this fall he lost paradise, wherein was tranquillity and the tree of life, (that is, he lost bliss and immortality.)

The penalty annexed to the breach of the law, with the sentence pronounced by God upon it, shews this.—The penalty stands thus: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." How was this executed? He did eat; but in the day he did eat, he did *not actually die,* but was turned out of paradise from the tree of life, and shut out forever from it, "lest he should take thereof and live forever." This shews that the state of paradise was a *state of immortality, of life without end;* which he lost that very day that he ate. His life began from thence to shorten and waste, and to have an end; and from thence to his actual death, was but like the time of a prisoner between the sentence and the execution which was in view and certain. Death then entered and shewed his face, which before was shut out and not known. So St. Paul: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;" (that is, a state of death and mortality.) And "In Adam *all* die;" that is, by reason of his transgression, all men are mortal and come to die. Rom. v. 12, and 1 Cor. xv. 22.

This is so clear in these cited places, and so much the current of the New Testament, that nobody can deny but that the doctrine of the gospel is that death came on all men by Adam's sin—only they differ about the signification of the word *death.*

Some will have it to be *a state of guilt,* wherein not only he, but all his posterity was so involved, that every one descended of him *deserved endless torment in hell-fire.* I shall say nothing more here how far (in the apprehensions of men) this consists with the justice and goodness of God, having mentioned it above. But it seems a strange way of understanding a law, (which requires the plainest and most direct words,) that by *death* should be meant *eternal life in misery.* Could any be supposed by a law that says, "For felony thou shalt *die,*" not that he should lose his life; but be kept *alive,* in perpetual, exquisite torments? And would any one think himself fairly dealt with that was so used?

In addition to this, they would have it to be also a state of *necessary sinning;* and of provoking God in every action that men do—a yet harder sense of the word *death* than the other. God says, "that in the *day* that thou eatest of the forbidden fruit, thou shalt *die*"—that is, (according to this doctrine,) thou and thy posterity shall be ever after incapable of doing anything but what shall be *sinful* and provoking to me; and shall justly deserve my wrath and indignation! Could a worthy man be supposed to put such terms upon the obedience of his subjects, much less can the righteous God be supposed (as a *punishment of one sin* wherewith he is displeased) to put a man under a necessity of sinning continually, and so multiplying the provocation? The reason of this strange interpretation we shall perhaps find in some mistaken places of the New Testament.

I must confess by death here, I can understand nothing but a *ceasing to be,* (that is, the losing of all actions of life and sense.) Such a death came on Adam and all his posterity by his first disobedience in paradise; under which death they would have lain forever, had it not been for the redemption by Jesus Christ.

If by the death threatened to Adam, were meant *the corruption of human nature in his posterity,* it is strange that the New Testament should not any where take notice of it, and tell us that *corruption*

seized on all, because of Adam's transgression, as well as it tells us so of death. But (as I remember) every one's sin is charged upon himself only.

Another part of the sentence was, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;" "*in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread* till thou return unto the ground: For out of it wast thou taken. Dust thou art; and unto dust thou shalt return." This shews that Paradise was a place of *bliss* as well as immortality; without toil and without sorrow. But, when man was turned out, he was exposed to the toil, anxieties and frailties of this mortal life, which should end in the *dust*, out of which he was made, and to which he should return; and then, have no more life or sense than the dust had, out of which he was made.

As Adam was *turned out* of Paradise, so all his posterity was *born out* of it; out of the reach of the tree of life. All, like their father Adam, in a state of mortality; void of the tranquillity and bliss of Paradise. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

WE CANNOT BY RIGHT COMPLAIN OF THIS LOSS.

But here will occur the common objection, that so many stumble at: *How doth it consist with the justice and goodness of God, that the posterity of Adam should suffer for his sin*—the innocent be punished for the guilty?

Very well, if keeping one from what he has no right to, be called a punishment. The state of immortality in Paradise is not *due* to the posterity of Adam more than to any other creature. Nay, if God affords them a temporary, mortal life, it is his gift; they owe it to his bounty, they could not claim it as their right; nor does he injure them when he takes it from them. Had he taken from mankind anything that was their right, or did he put men in a state of misery worse than *not being*, without any fault or demerit of their own, this indeed would be hard to reconcile with the notion we have of justice, and much more with the goodness and other attributes of the Supreme Being, (which he has declared of himself, and which reason as well as revelation must acknowledge to be in him,) unless we will confound good and evil, God and Satan. That such a state of extreme irremediable torment is worse than no being at all, if every one's sense did not determine against the vain philosophy and foolish metaphysics of some men, yet our Saviour's peremptory decision has put it past doubt that one *may be* in such a state that it had been "good for him not to have been born." But that such a temporary life as we now have, with all its frailties and ordinary miseries, is better than *no being*, is evident by the high value we put upon such a life ourselves.

And therefore, though all die in Adam, yet none are truly *punished* but for their own deeds. "God will render to every one (how?) according to his deeds." "To those that obey unrighteousness, indignation, and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doth evil." "We must appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad." And Christ himself, (who knew for what he should condemn men at the last day) assures us in the two places where he describes his proceeding at the great judgment that the sentence of condemnation passes only on the workers of iniquity; that is, such as neglected to fulfil the law in acts of charity. Matt. vii. 23 and 25: 41 and 42; Luke xiii. 27. And again, our Saviour tells the Jews "that all shall come forth out of their graves; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurection of damnation." But here is no condemnation of any one, for what his forefather Adam had done, which it is not likely should have been omitted, if that should have been a cause why any one was adjudged to the fire, with the devil and his angels, And he tells his disciples, that when he comes again with his angels in the glory of his Father, "that then he will render to every one according to his works." Matt. xxvi. 27.

Debate on Human Immortality.

AT THE BRISTOL ATHENÆUM, ENGLAND.

We had the pleasure of attending recently an interesting debate by the members of the Discussion Society, a flourishing and highly important body connected with the Bristol Athenæum, on the following proposition:—"*Nature affords no evidence of Human Immortality.*" It is not our intention to furnish anything of the nature of a report of the debate, but merely to offer a few observations on one or two points, upon which the opponents of the above proposition laid considerable emphasis in support of their side of the question. It was affirmed by several, and too much conceded by all, that there was a *common sentiment of all mankind* in favor of the constitutional immortality of man. We pause not now to remark on the *kind* of immortality and soul-nature asserted by the ancient speculators on the subject, viz.,—their *pre-existence* and *transmigration* theories, which, we presume, the modern advocates of natural immortality will not be willing to accept, as they ought consistently, when they appeal to the opinions of the ancient philosophers, in evidence of their theory. This we pass by for the sake of challenging the assumption, that *all mankind have ever accepted the doctrine of natural human immortality.* Certain philosophers of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome,—who, by the way, ought not to be regarded as so many *independent* testimonies,—taught this opinion without doubt, but that it was the common opinion of all, even in these countries, is no by means true. The doctrines of Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates, and Zoroaster were the opinions of the philosophic few, not the expositions of the faith of the common people. Let Socrates himself, the intellectual champion of the soul, be our witness. "Can this soul of ours," he asks, "being such and of such a nature, when separated from the body be immediately dispersed and destroyed, *as most men assert?*" Phaedo 68. According to Socrates "most men" asserted the *destruction* of the soul in death. They who are familiar with the reasoning of the Phaedo, and subscribing to the basis of

the argument, are prepared to affirm with Cato,

It must be so—Plato, thou reasonest well;

should be content with the strength of the Socratic superstructure, and never think in the face of their champion's testimony to the contrary, of superadding the common-place argument of the common consent of mankind. The Athenian philosopher knew that no such common consent existed, and hence the necessity of his elaborated argument to produce that consent. But why in the enumeration of the opinions of mankind should the *Hebrews* and *Arabians* be omitted? Both these peoples had their philosophic sects, as the Pharisees among the former, who subscribed to the oriental conceit of the soul's separate state and immortality; but the faith of the people generally was not identical with that of their speculative school-men. Omitting any reference to the sacred Scriptures, which the rules of the Ath. Soc. forbid to be cited in evidence, and where undoubtedly the popular doctrine is emphatically denied, we may yet turn to other Jewish literature, where the opinions of the Jews are recorded, for the sake of testing the assertion of a universal assent of mankind; and if we refer to the Apocryphal writings, the evidence is decisive against this common-place assumption. "Who shall praise the Most High *in the grave*," asks the author of Ecclesiasticus, ch. xvii. 27—32, "instead of them which *live* and give thanks? Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead, *as from one that is not:* the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. For all things cannot be in men, *because the son of man is not immortal.*" Again, "O Elias, how wast thou honored in thy wondrous deeds! . . who didst raise up a dead man from death, *and his soul from the place of the dead*, by the word of the Most High,"—ch. xlviii. 4, 5. When Phariseeism flourished among the Hebrews, which was not even known till after the Babylonish captivity, then this ancient Hebrew faith in the non-immortality of man was pushed in some cases, as is natural, to an extreme—even to the denial of any kind of spiritual existence, and any future life at all; as in the case of the antagonistic sect of the Sadducees, from whose rash ultraism many sought their hope of a future life in the Babylonish fancies of the newly imported philosophy of Phariseeism. We have alluded also to Arabia as furnishing another exception to the assertion of a common consent among mankind. Dr. Good says, "If we turn from Persia, Egypt and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which it is certain that Persia, and highly probable, that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject (viz., the immortality of the soul) left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief." Ecclesiastical historians have marked the fact that the philosophers of Arabia denied the natural immortality of man, and tell us that Origen was sent thither to teach them the Pythagorean philosophy of immortal-soulism. Here are then considerable exceptions to the alleged common consent of mankind, and, consequently, the argument, such as it is, falls to the ground.

We were much surprised that the eloquent opponent of the introducer of this question at the Athenæum debate should have sought an argument in support of the immortal soul theory in the emphasized assertion, that *as matter is indestructible, therefore, what is not matter, viz., the soul, is, a fortiori, indestructible.* Did we hold the theory of the immortality of the soul on the ground of its being, as alleged, an *immaterial* principle, the very argument we should admit, of the non-destructibility of matter, would supply us with an argument for the *destructibilty* of the mind or soul. For the word *im*material is the negation of what is material,—the *opposite* and *contrast* of materiality,—and, therefore, has none of the properties or attributes of that which is material. If, therefore matter is *in*destructible, that which is *not* matter or *im*material, for the reason assigned above, must be capable of *destruction.* This reasoning, if not altogether satisfactory, has as good claim to the Catonian commendation as any arguments in the Phaedo. But when it was asserted that matter is indestructible, is it meant *absolutely* indestructible? Granted that *man* cannot destroy a single particle of the material globe, but does it follow that the *Maker* of matter cannot destroy that which He created? If it be allowed that God created the matter of the universe, it must also be allowed that He can destroy it. So that the assertion is only *relatively* true that matter is indestructible.

What, however, has the destructibility or otherwise of matter to do with the question—"Nature affords no evidence of human immortality?" The affirmants of this proposition make no assertion about the nature and properties of matter: they assert that the being called *Man* is the mysterious product of organization,—that he depends upon his organization for conscious life, and the capability of developing the varied phenomena of his being; and that when he is *disorganized*, he, the being, man, ceases to be. The elements of his being may not be destroyed, but in their dispersion, have sought other affinities, and entered into other organic relations, but *he*, the being, *man*, who depended on their chemical union in the human organism, perishes in their dispersion. He shares the fate of all physical organisms,—as the brute, and the plant when disorganized and reduced to their elements cease to be respectively an *animal* and *plant* nature, so he also, in the same catastrophe, ceases to be a *man*,—like them he ceases entirely to be. The consolation to mortal man in the contemplation of death is, that, in his case, a merciful promise is given by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, that a life of fidelity to truth and righteousness shall be rewarded by a *reorganization* in his personal resurrection from the dead. So that, although he dies like brute beasts which perish, *un*like them, he has the sublime possibility of living again in "the resurrection unto life."—*Ham's Ch. Examiner.*

Br. C. F. Hudson's article came too late for this number, but will appear in the next.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 15, 1854.

"MATERIALISM UNSCRIPTURAL: or, *the Doctrines of George Storrs Refuted. By Rev. N. D. George.*"

Such is the title of a Tract recently issued by the Methodist Episcopal Tract Society, New-York. It is substantially the same matter we noticed last winter, which appeared in nine articles, *Zion's Herald*, Boston, Mass.

What our name was attached to it for, unless to catch attention, we do not know, for our friend, George has given us but a small portion of his attention, in his tract of 48 pages. He has made another person, many of whose sentiments we never approved, the prominent object of his attack. It was well that in re-publishing the articles from the *Herald*, either himself or the Publishers of the Tract struck from the title the words, "*Examined* and." For it is apparent that it is *not* an "*examination* of the Doctrines of Geo. Storrs," as the author does not presume to look at the foundation stone of the theory we advocate. He gives us a passing *fling* and rushes on to meet one whom he can more easily refute; but, lest he should not have sufficient cause to triumph before men, he places our name at the head, or sets us up "on high," as Ahab did Naboth, that he might seem to have the greater victory; but we can forewarn him in this mattter that his end will be as inglorious as that of Ahab.

Why did he not keep to his text, "and examiand refute the doctrines of George Storrs"? Why did he leave his text to wander somewhere else? We think we understand the reason. Our foundation was too *material* for the weapons he had to attack with. He could not strike us at the root without pouring contempt on the Mosaic account of man's creation, thus showing that himself and associate laborers are the real "infidels." "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground," saith the inspired record; and all the wood, hay, and stubble of theological patch work, ever put forth by the advocates of *im*materialism, falls to the ground before the Divine testimony of man's origin, as Dagon fell before the Ark of God.

A few things are introduced into the Tract, relative to our views, not embraced in the original articles; these we may notice after a while; but in the meantime, if our readers will turn to our article in the Examiner for Dec, 1853, and the continuation of the subject in a few numbers the first of this year, they will find a sufficient "*refutation*" of N. D. George's effort, so far as "the Doctrines of Geo. Storrs" are concerned. If N. D. George would like to try his skill truly, on our views, our columns are open for him. Let the question be stated fairly—"*Did the Lord God form man of matter?*" Will Mr. George or any of the Methodist Tract publishers take the *negative* of this question? We *affirm* that God did so form man; and that hence the very heading of the Tract before us is *bare-faced "Infidelity."* Come then to rescue of your own characters, ye who are casting stones at us. The Examiner is open for any of you who stand approved of those on your side of the question.

A DILEMMA.—Dr. Adam Clarke, the learned English commentator, was a believer in the immortal-soul theory; hence sometimes found himself in a hard place, where *guessing* had to answer for facts. In his note on Acts 9: 40, where Peter was instrumental in raising the deceased Dorcas to life, and it is said, Peter "turning to the *body*," says Dr. C., "*soma*; the lifeless body, for the spirit had already departed." Well, what did Peter say to this "lifeless body," whose "spirit had *departed*" to heaven, as the Doctor held? He "Said, *Tabitha arise.*" Now it is very strange that Peter should think of calling on "the lifeless body to *arise* without first calling on the "*departed* spirit" to *return!* But strange to tell, not one word is said about that "spirit" in the whole transaction! But Peter calls "the body" *Tabitha*, and said, "*arise.*" Now the body was Tabitha or it was not. If it was, then the "departed spirit" was not, and had no conscious existence except in fable or theological speculation. If the body was not Tabitha, then Peter made a great blunder in calling it so; but that he did not mistake in the matter is evident from the fact that when he thus spoke, "*She* opened *her* eyes; and when *she* saw Peter *she* sat up." Strange that such small things should be so particularly noticed and not one word be said about getting her soul back from heaven, and its coming into the cage again.

We come now to the dilemma of Dr. Clarke: He says:—

"As Dorcas was a woman so eminently holy, her happy soul had DOUBTLESS gone to the Paradise of God. Must she not therefore be filled with regret to find herself thus called back to earth again? And must not the remembrance of the glories she had now lost, fill her with dislike to all the goods of earth? No: for 1. as a saint of God, her Makers *will* must be *her's*; because she knew that

will must be ever *best*. 2. It is VERY LIKELY that in the case of the revivescence of saint or sinner, God MERCIFULLY *draws a veil* over all they have seen or known, so that they have no recollection of what they have either seen or heard. Even St. Paul found it IMPOSSIBLE to tell what he had heard in the third heavens, though he was PROBABLY NOT in the state of the dead. Of the economy of the invisible world, God will REVEAL NOTHING."

Here is a great man completely swamped by his immortal-soul theory. The words "doubtless—very likely—impossible—mercifully—probably not," and "reveal nothing," in the remarks of the Doctor, we have marked in small-caps to call attention to the vain conjectures and bold assumptions to which the advocates of the common theory are driven.

What is to be done with poor Dorcas' immortal soul that had gone to Paradise, i. e. to heaven? How is it to be reconciled to coming back again? Even her "Maker's *will*" could not quite satisfy Dr. Clark in the case; how much less then the "*happy soul*" of Dorcas herself? The Dr. is in a dilemma! What shall he do? Why, he invents the "*very likely*" notion that "God *mercifully* DRAWS A VEIL OVER *all*" she had "*seen or known*!" He was afraid, "*doubtless*," that without this, Dorcas might rebel against His "*will!*" And to give plausibility to this assumption in support of a baseless theory, the Doctor perverts fact in Paul's case. He says, "Paul found it *impossible* to tell what he had heard in the third heaven," &c. On what ground was it impossible? Was it because God had drawn "a veil over" it? No such thing. For such a lively view had the apostle retained of those "abundant revelations" that he had to take a "thorn in the flesh, lest" he "should be exalted above measure." If he had only found Dr. Clarke's "*veil*" he could well have been spared the "*thorn*."

But, says the Doctor, Paul "was *probably not* in the state of the dead." Thank the Doctor for that admission; for, if he was not in that state whatever he saw or heard is no evidence that dead men can see or hear; and that they do not see nor hear, when actually dead, is abundantly testified in Scripture; and we have no occasion to resort to such vain conjectures and subterfuges as the Dr. is here driven into to hide the nakedness of his *ghostly* theory of "Dorcas' happy soul" going to "paradise" at death.

Finally, the Doctor, to solve the whole mystery of these "*Know-nothing*" resurrected ones, adds—"Of the economy of the invisible world God will *reveal nothing*." Hear that, all ye who unfold so vividly the flight of souls to Heaven, and describe their state and condition there! Remember Dr. Clarke's words, and stop your speculations: "*God will reveal nothing;*" and if you pretend to know about it, either you or Dr. C. are mistaken. "But then the Doctor was in a *dilemma* or he would not have said so!" No doubt he was, and all other advocates of the theory of the distinct and separate conscious existence of an entity called the soul are in the same dilemma.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

Our friend Clark, of the *Christian Advocate*, passes very lightly over the Rich man and Lazarus, though he says "The parable is perfectly in point." He remarks:—

"The objection that this is a parable will not avail to break the force of the great moral truth it teaches. It is either history or a parable: if history, then it is a record of events that have actually taken place; if a parable then it is a representation of events that may occur."

The oft-repeated assertion that a parable is, in all cases, a representation by something that has been or may be, is a mere assumption, and is contrary to truth. Let any one read the parable of Jotham, Judges 9th, or the parable of the two "great eagles," Ezekiel 17th, which is given by God himself, and he will be satisfied that parables are not always taken from things that have been or may be.

That a parable is "a representation of events that may occur," we readily admit; but what should we think of taking a house to represent a house; a lamb to represent a lamb; a prison to represent a prison? In other words, what should we think of taking the identical state or thing to represent that state or thing? It would, in fact, be no representation at all. As Dr. Clark admits this scripture to be a parable it cannot be a representation of a particular person, or persons, in the literal state of death; hence, we are compelled to look for some other event or events that are represented than that of literally dead men; and especially as we are not to assume, without undeniable evidence, that our Lord contradicted the testimony of the prophets, who declare that in the day of man's death "his thoughts perish," Psa. 146: 4, that "the dead praise not the Lord," Psa. 115: 17, that, there is "no remembrance of God in death," Psa. 6: 5, that death is "a land of darkness as darkness itself," Job 10: 22, that "the dead know not any thing," Eccl. 9: 5, and that "thers is *no knowledge* in *sheol*," Eccl. 9: 10.

This last text has the exact corresponding word to express the condition, or state, of the dead with that used in the parable by our Lord, and translated *hell*. *Sheol* is the Hebrew word in Eccl. 9 : 10, and *Hades* is the Greek word in the parable; though our translators have rendered that in Eccl. *grave*, and in the parable *hell*; words which are of precisely the same import, as any one can see by comparing Psa. 16 : 10, with Acts 2 : 31, in which places these corresponding words are both rendered *hell;* and in the latter place is a quotation of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, showing that Christ had a *resurrection* from the state of death—from *sheol* or *hades*—wherein inspiration declares there is no knowledge. Now we ask our friend Clark, in all candor, if he really believes that our Lord did intend, by a parable, to contradict the plain and expiciit testimony of the Old Testament scriptures? He had commanded us to *search* those scriptures as revealing to us eternal life: those scriptures reveal to us the state of death as being one without thought—without knowledge —as a state in which there is no "reward," Eccl. 9 : 5, where we cannot praise God, &c., and all this in plain, positive language. In the face of all this testimony, shall we—*dare we*—affirm that our Lord Jesus Christ covertly—in a parable—taught directly an opposite doctrine? And that too, when he never once directly affirmed that literally dead men are in a conscious state; but taught his followers he would raise them up from the dead "at the last day?" He must be credulous indeed, or strangely entangled by the "traditions of men," who can thus interpret the teaching of him who is "the way, the truth, and the life."

The parable is the "representation of events" which were about to take place, *viz*: a change in the dispensations from the Mosaic to the Christian, as the context shows, verse 16 : which would remove the peculiarities of the Jewish economy, introducing a more spiritual one, adapted to all nations, or embracing those who were not under the law given by Moses, called *goyim* in Hebrew, and *ethnos* in Greek, or *gentiles*. This change in God's administration with men was in fact a falling back on the covenant He made with "*Abraham*" before the law was given, and which embraced "all the families of the earth;" tho' up to the advent of Christ, the Jews only had shared, evidently, in that peculiar favor, and hence it was especially their "life time." By their rejection of Christ—as their dispensation then passed away—they are *represented* in a state of death, which was a political and ecclesiastical death; in which, of course, that people were not literally dead, and hence could be, in truth, represented in a most wretched condition—or in torments. Such has been their condition for near 1800 years, and their claim of relationship to Abraham has brought them no relief.

On the other hand the change in the dispensations, which revived the Abrahamic covenant and brought it out fully to the view of the *ethnos*—the Gentiles—placed the believing among them in that relation to Abraham which is aptly "represented" by being in "Abraham's bosom," whither they had been brought through the ministration of angels, or *messengers*,—for so the word signifies—who have proclaimed the love of God to "the world," and not exclusively to one nation.

In a parable we are to look only for the main scope and design of it; and not like some mere theorists and speculators attempt to find something to correspond with every minutiæ that is introduced into it. This parable we regard in the light, then, of a simple and forcible "representation" of the different states of those under the law covenant, and those who were turned to the covenant of grace, or favor, made through Abraham in Jesus Christ, and fully opened at the advent of Jesus some 1800 years ago, and which is still in force, so that they who are Christ's are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," and "are blessed with faithful Abraham;" having promise of life eternal when Christ shall return "*from* heaven" to raise all his saints from the dead "at the last day."

Dr. Clark next speaks as follows in support of the theory he advocates—

"When St. John, upon the Isle of Patmos, had heard the wonderful revelations made to him, filled with wonder and astonishment, he fell down to worship the messenger of God; but that messenger said, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book.' Rev. xxii, 9. Do we not here obtain a glimpse of not only the conscious being, but the avocations also of those who have died in the faith?"

This text affords not the sligtest countenance to the theory that dead men are conscious. Enoch and Elijah were "translated that they should not see death," which was no great advantage if friend Clark's theory is the truth. Either of these men might have been the person who addressed John. Both of them were "prophets." Unless then it can be proved that John was addressed by one who had actually died, here is nothing to help the common theory: there is not even a "glimpse" to help our friend in his effort. Br. Clark proceeds—

"St. John says: 'I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God: and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true? . . . And white robes were given unto every one of them, and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season.' Rev. vi. 9–11. These souls not only possessed a conscious existence after they had been 'slain' for the cause of Christ, but they were also conscious of the wrong they had suffered, and were looking forward to the period of their vindication with anxious desire. Nor was this all; 'they cried with a loud voice,' and were afterward robed in white, and told to rest yet a little season. Here, then, they have a conscious existence, power to express their desires, and capability of being comforted by gracious assurances. Though persecution had done its work, and the bodies of the martyrs had been consumed by the faggot, or devoured by wild beasts, or wasted in deep and dark dungeons or dens and caverns of the earth, yet, after it had destroyed the body, there was a conscious life remaining over which it had no power."

We give our friend the benefit of his entire remarks in this case; and we must say, that we should think any sober and reflecting mind must see how vain it is to appeal to this text in support of the common theory. In the first place, these souls had no existence at the time of John's vision of them, nor for several centuries after, probably; as it is most likely it is a representation of the feelings of persons suffering by the Papal persecutions; it being the fifth seal. The Doctor saith, "These souls had been *slain!*" Were immortal, undying souls "slain?" Did men "kill" them? So it would seem, according to the Dr. But unfortunately for his theory these souls had *blood*, which is *material*: "how long dost thou not avenge *our blood*," say they. They were not *theological* souls then, whatever else they might be. And then they seem not very happy, for they are "looking forward to the period of their vindication with *anxious desire*," saith the Dr.; and they are "conscious of the wrong they had suffered," he affirms. Now all this does not look much like being in Heaven, does it friend Clark? But it does look as though it might be a true "representation" of the feelings of suffering saints, while yet on earth, under a long and bloody persecution, which seemed to have no end; and the white robes seem to "represent" the "righteousness" which they would obtain in enduring the long night of persecution they were passing through, after which they were to "*rest* a little season"—not in heaven, but "under the altar"—that is, "in the dust of the earth," till the trial of others should be also ended. To talk of giving *immaterial* souls white robes, in heaven, to cover them; and of their "being comforted," there, with the "assurances" of their "blood" being "avenged" *after* they are introduced into the glorious society of heaven, surely needs some plainer testimony than we have ever yet seen to make it even look like truth.

We pass what the Doctor saith on, "whether in the body or out of the body," with a brief remark, because we have so lately spoken of this text in another place. The Doctor says, If "the apostle" had not "believed that the soul may have a conscious existence out of the body—how could he have been in doubt whether *his soul* was really in the body or not?"

Paul saith not one word about "*his* soul," nor any other person's *soul* in the transaction. Paul was not in the habit of talking about "the soul" like modern theologians. He talks of *man*—"I knew a *man*," &c; that *man* had a "vision;" how, or in what manner it was made he could not tell, for he did not know, but God did, and there he leaves it. Here is no proof of the conscious existence of a man when dead, or of a distinct entity in man called the soul.

We come now to Dr. Clark's last text. He says—

"One more passage upon this point must suffice, though it would be difficult to exhaust the many Scripture proofs that bear upon it. St. Paul says that Christ Jesus 'died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.' 1 Thess. v, 10. How emphatic! Whether we wake or sleep, live or die, whether we are in this world or the other, we shall live together with him, shall enjoy his life and the consolation of his Spirit here, and, in the eternal world, shall be glorified together with him! These words show that everywhere, and in all circumstances, genuine believers, who walk with God, *have life*—and not only life, but also communion with Him who is the source of all life. Indeed, they clearly express that, so far as the great ends of spiritual life and communion are concerned, the living have no advantage over the dead."

This is the first time we recollect to have seen this text introduced in support of the common theory; and we rather think if it was so "difficult to exhaust the Scripture proofs," on the subject, it would never have been introduced. It is "emphatic," that is certain; but not in favor of Dr. Clark's theory. It is emphatic in favor of the apostle's theory which he had just expressed in the previous verses, *viz.*,—That that there is hope for the dead saints, because Jesus died and rose again; therefore God will bring up from the dead all that sleep in Jesus, and those who are alive at the time of that event will "not go before them that are asleep; *for* the Lord himself shall descend from

heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and THE DEAD IN CHRIST shall RISE FIRST; THEN we which are *alive* and remain shall be caught up *together with them* [the raised ones,] in the clouds *to* MEET the Lord in the air; and *so* shall we be ever with the Lord."

Here, then, is *how* the saints are to "live together with" Christ: not through death, nor in death, but by a RESURRECTION from the dead, if "asleep in the dust of the earth," at his return "from heaven;" or, if alive, by a change to immortality, in a "moment, in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump." Compare 1 Thess. 4: 13—18; and 5: 1—11, with 1 Cor. 15: 61—54. We regard the appeal to 1 Thess. 5: 10, by our friend C., as most unfortunate for his theory; and instead of affording any support to it, taken with the context, is its most ample refutation.

More Assumptions.

Zion's Herald, for July 26th, has a communication from D. Todd, on the inquiry, "Has man a soul?" It is placed on the last page of that folio sheet, which is a retired position. We cannot wonder at it, as the author is too far *behind* the times to appear in a very conspicuous position.—As a theological curiosity we give his first argument to our readers. It might be well to place it in some theological museum. To the question,—"Has man a soul?" the writer says:

"We argue the affirmative first, from the fact that he was created in the image of God—in holiness, righteousness, and knowledge. God is a spirit. No matter, no form, or combination of matter can receive the impress of Jehovah's attributes, his moral likeness; but man was created in the image of God; therefore, man has a soul, a spirit on which that likeness was impressed."

If assumptions could be admitted as proof, this assumer has doubtless carried all before him. The principal assumption is, that man was created in the image of God's "holiness," and of course must have a soul to "receive the impress of Jehovah's attributes, his moral likeness." That man was made in God's "moral likeness" is a pure assumption without one solitary text of Scripture to sustain it. By the superiority of man's organism, over other animals, laying the foundation for superior intellectual development, he was made capable of understanding law addressed to his mind, and so was fitted to make a MORAL development under the appliance of a law—not without it. Every thing the Lord God made was pronounced "VERY GOOD;" but not one thing was pronounced HOLY; because holiness is a development, not a CREATION. Holiness, so far as created beings are concerned, is the result of action under some rule or law. "Where there is no law there is no transgression;" and, by consequence, where there is no law, there is no such thing as holiness. Holiness, in created beings, never exists till there is ACTION in relation to some given rule of conduct. Adam, therefore, at his creation, was NOT possessed of the moral image of God: whatever the image was, it was not what this writer, in Zion's Herald, affirms. Nor is there any evidence that man, by sin, absolutely lost the image of God in which he was created; but the contrary is clearly the doctrine of the Bible. God assigned as a reason why the murderer should die, after the flood, that "in the image of God made he man;" Gen. 9: 6. Paul saith, "MAN ought not to cover his head, [when he prayeth] forasmuch as he is the IMAGE and glory of God; 1 Cor. 11: 7. James saith, "Men are made after the SIMILITUDE of God;" Jas. 3: 9. This testimony establishes the fact that man still possesses the image of God,—the likeness, the resemblance, the similitude, whatever it was; hence it was not holiness; and all such assumptions are purely gratuitous and unwarranted except by the "TRADITIONS OF MEN," through which "God's counsel" is made "void."

REV. EDWARD WHITE.—The following communication from Br. White, we trust, will be carefully read and duly weighed, comparing it with the Scriptures of truth. We think it is a subject that deserves unprejudiced attention; and after the able articles of Br. Ham, just finished in the BIBLE EXAMINER, we judge it right and desirable that another, in England, should have the privilege to respond in our columns, and we trust that Br. Ham will take no exceptions to this course, tho' he might have preferred that the response should first appear in the *Christian Examiner*, but Br. White has chosen otherwise, and we cannot sit as judge in that matter. We love and honor them both. May the Lord bless them and us—guiding each of us into all truth—the LOVE of it, and bring us to His kingdom through His Son.

The Propitiatory Death of Christ.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner.

MY DEAR SIR:—I avail myself thankfully of your invitation "to make it appear that it is impossible to do greater violence to the Scriptures than to attempt to expel from them the doctrine of the propitiatory death of Christ, AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE BAPTIST AND CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN."

The proviso above printed in small capitals, is a very essential qualification of my promise, for I should be sorry to undertake a defence of that which Mr. Ham has all along represented as the doctrine of "popular Christianity," on the subject of the Atonement. He everywhere represents this popular doctrine to be that the crucifixion of Christ was "designed by God himself for his own personal satisfaction as the moral governor of the world;" and he opposes to this notion his own view "that we are saved by the free grace or unpurchased mercy of our gracious Father, through Jesus Christ, the Mediator or medial personage through whom God dispenses these blessings of great salvation." Now, in the fewest words I beg to state, without wasting your space in prolonged expression of wonder at Mr. Ham's mistake, that he has egregiously misrepresented "popular Christianity" amongst us, and I should think among you. He has wasted his ammunition upon a pasteboard fortress. The veritable Silistria has yet to be assailed. Universally in England among our churches, the work of Mr. Gilbert (husband of the celebrated Ann Taylor, author of Hymns for Infant Minds,) on the Atonement, is regarded as setting forth the prevailing views on this subject. He was appointed Congregational Lecturer in order to express them. From that work any reader may easily satisfy himself that whatever a few fanatics may rave in obscure corners about "personal satisfaction," a very different doctrine prevails through the length and breadth of the country. There will be found abundant evidence of the fact, and of our belief of it, that the very notion of the Christian Atonement excludes the conception that it was designed by God himself as a personal satisfaction. Mr. Gilbert, following in the track of all the best writers, points out the eternal distinction between the Fatherly and the Royal characters of God, his private relationship to the sinner, and his public relationship to the universe. He shows that the idea of demanding personal satisfaction for sin is incompatible with the idea of the party offended against, himself providing the ransom for sinners. God himself has "set forth this propitiation," and therefore it is absurd to attribute to him personally vindictive feelings against the sinner. It is the Regal character of God as the Holy and Benevolent Governor of the creation which demanded a signal display of the perpetuity of the Law which unites sin and suffering, in the act of pardoning the transgressor himself: while His paternal character prompted him to provide the means of "reconciling the world unto Himself." Paul does not say "of reconciling Himself to the world." That was never needed. God's personal feelings were always compassionate. We believe as firmly as any objector, that "we are saved by the free grace of our gracious Father," but we also hold that since God is holy as well as kind, King of the Universe as well as Father of the sinner, He has been pleased to manifest this mercy under a dispensation of providence which awfully evinced that He has not laid aside His judicial righteousness. Mr. Ham, I think, evidently mistakes the proof of one proposition for the disproof of another. It may be true that God's personal wrath was not appeased or satisfied by the death of Christ; and yet it may be true that His judicial character as Public Governor was vindicated, and the moral interests of the creation conserved by that "declaration of his righteousness." Rom. 3: 26. "Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation, to declare his righteousness with respect to the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." If it should be replied that in the sentence referred to Mr. Ham has used the phrase, "God's personal satisfaction AS MORAL GOVERNOR," the rejoinder is that such a combination of terms is utterly indefensible. Personal satisfaction, is a phrase which implies personal angry feeling to be appeased; and such a phrase is not applicable to the calm and holy moral administration of God. A righteous King may heartily love his rebellious child, yet, find himself unable in consistency with his own Public Honor, and the moral welfare of his dominion to pardon him by a mere act of arbitrary forgiveness, unattended by any display of his judicial righteousness and respect for his own Authority. If Mr. Ham intends to deny the real validity of the distinction between the Fatherly and the Royal characters of God, he must establish his position by arguments which have not yet appeared: and which I suspect will have some difficulty in appearing. Mr. H. believes in a final tremendous display of the righteousness of God in the punishment of sinners, notwithstanding the "free grace" of the Heavenly Father, and it is for him to show why it is more contradictory to the divine goodness to believe in the manifestation of that grace through the sacrifice of Christ, in vindication of the Divine holiness, than it is to believe in an ultimate exhibition of that holiness in the penal sufferings of the condemned. If in the one case there be no "personal satisfaction," as Mr. Ham would admit, why should there be in the other?

With respect to the allegation that if Christ has satisfied the divine justice by his merits, we are saved by merits and not by grace, it is sufficient to reply that this objection too is founded upon a gross commercial view of the death of Christ which is generally repudiated by intelligent believers, and therefore cannot be introduced into the controversy by any one really desirous of doing justice to his opponents, and to the argument.

These are preliminaries; but it was necessary to fill up some of the pitfalls constructed by Mr. H., before we can with advantage erect that battery of Scripture which will, I think, crumble his theological fortress to atoms, even when the fire is directed by the feeblest of hands.

The argument, then, that Christ did thus "suffer for sins, the just for the unjust," 1 Pet. 3: 18, consists of three principal parts. The FIRST is derived from considerations on the nature of the Hebrew sacrifices, and the application of the terms which denote them to the death of Christ in the New Testament writings;—the SECOND, from declarations in the ancient prophetic Scriptures;—and the THIRD from the language of the New Testament itself.

Mr. Ham disposes of the argument derived from considerations in the nature of the Hebrew sacri-

fices for sin, by such observations as these. He says, "An elaborate ritualistic worship, like that of the ancient Hebrews, affords abundant scope for ingenuity to expatiate in. Highly imaginative minds, fond of curious speculations, have by the arts of a Christian Cabalism discovered in the Scripture sacrifices all their own favorite dogmas; and having imposed upon these symbolic institutions their own cabalistic interpretations, they employ them, after the illogical fashion of reasoning in a circle, as arguments for the truth of those dogmas." He then affirms that it is our duty "to seek in the Scriptures itself for the key to their interpretation," and proceeds to "indicate this general principle"—that they signified and expounded personal duty and expressed personal professions of reverence for the will of God, denying that they were intendended to teach "expiation by substitutionary suffering."

It is somewhat amusing to find such writers as Dr. Pye Smith, and George Hanley Taber, our two most learned recent authors on Expiatory Sacrifice, set down among "highly imaginative minds, fond of curious speculations:"—each of them being men singularly free from poetry and enthusiasm, and if ever men were free from cabalistic mysticism, free from it. Our worthy friend must please to qualify his censure a little, and admit that at least some men of cool heads, and vast learning, and great piety, are profoundly convinced believers that the Hebrew sacrifices signified something more than he in his learning and coolness is willing to allow to them. For my part, I must beg you, Br. Storrs, to print, and not to omit—the expression of my deep and respectful persuasion, that something much more weighty than this fling at the Cabalists will be necessary to overturn the great works in English Theology which establish the piacular character of many of the Jewish sacrifices.

Mr. Ham, as I have shown, now and then mistakes the honest proof of one thing, for the disproof of another; and that when there is no consideration whatever to prevent both being true. Nobody doubts that many of the Hebrew sacrifices were eucharistic, or symbols setting forth the pious professions of the worshippers, and nobody that I ever heard of considers those particular sacrifices as "symbols of expiation by substitutionary suffering." But the question is, whether other some of the Hebrew sacrifices were not of this latter character; symbolic expiations; "SIN OFFERINGS."

There are some things that are so plain that the difficulty is to find media of proof whereby to convince those who deny them; and amongst such plain things most readers of the Bible reckon the fact that the Books of Moses describe sacrifices which were obviously designed to set forth the idea of expiation of sin by substitutionary sacrifice. Let any man seeking for truth without any theory or prejudice, (without Mr. Ham's theory among others,) examine all those passages in the books of Exodus and Leviticus which prescribe the ceremonial for the "trespass" and "sin-offerings" of Israel; let him observe the repeated command to "lay the hand upon the head of the sacrifice;" let him mark the explanation of that act distinctly given in Leviticus xvi, 21, where it is declared to signify "putting all the transgression of Israel upon the head of the goat,"—that goat which in the 10th verse is expressly said to be for an atonement to be presented before the Lord; literally, TO MAKE AN EXPIATION UPON HIM, LECOPHER ALO, and in the Septuagint TAU EXILASASTHAI EP AUTOU;—and then say whether it does not rather require a very "curious art of speculation" to expel this idea of substitutionary sacrifice from the scriptures. Set such a person to examine carefully the works of Outram, Pye Smith, and Faber, to which I have referred, and even let him consult the Hebrew Lexicon of the rationalist Gesenius in the department of sacrificial language, and I am much mistaken indeed if the result be not to lead him to denounce this attempt to persuade the people that a few gibes at imaginative spirits are sufficient to subvert the well-established conclusion in which after abundant examination had, all divines and all ages have agreed, with the exception of a few speculators who have distinguished themselves by the rejection of EVERY doctrine essentially Christian. The Jews at all events have uniformly received this notion from their own scriptures, as it was likely they should, considering the expressions employed. "The body of the sinner," says Aben-Ezra—(quoted by Pye Smith—"deserved to be burned for his sin, only the mercy of the Divine Nature accepted his offering as a substitute and propitiation, whose blood should be instead of his blood, and its life instead of his life."

Now the argument is that the terms which were employed by the Greek translators of the Old Testament scriptures to denote the expiatory sacrifices of the Mosaic writings, are employed by the New Testament writers to describe the death of Christ. In Leviticus iv, the HATTATH or sin-offering, is rendered by the Greek version AMARTIA; and this sacrificial term is applied to the death of Christ. "God sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and PERE AMARTIAS for sin, for a sin-offering, condemned sin in the flesh. Rom. viii. 3. And again, "For he hath made him to be SIN for us, (AMARTIA, a sin-offering) who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor. v. 21. If this be not the signification of the term in these two passages, can a more natural sense be found by one who denies that there is any such notion as imputation of merits or demerits in the Bible. The phrase "to be made sin on our behalf," take it how you will, must offer a serious difficulty to such a commentator.

Again the Apostle John affirms that Christ was an ILASMOS or propitiation for our sins, and for the sins of the whole world. 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 10. Now we find this term employed by the Septuagint as the translation of the Hebrew term HATTATH or sin-offering; as in Ezekiel xliv. 27. "And in the day that the priest, defiled by the dead, goeth into the sanctuary, unto the inner court, to minister in the sanctuary, he shall offer his sin-offering, ILASMON, saith the Lord God." Twice then the HATTATH was an expiatory sacrifice, a substitutionary sin-offering. If he did not

intend this, what in the name of all Hebrew and Greek did he intend? Mr. Ham will not deny that the death of Christ is spoken of by the apostle as an "offering and a sacrifice" presented to God "on our behalf," Eph. v. 2: and putting this together with the fact that other language is used which could suggest no other idea than that of an expiatory sacrifice for sins, is it too much to affirm that the popular dogma of redemption by the blood of Christ, is very much like the doctrine of the New Testament.

The SECOND argument is one which I believe Mr. Ham does not notice. In the PROPHETIC SCRIPTURES, the death of the Messiah is spoken of as plainly as possible under the character of a TRESPASS-OFFERING for the sins of mankind. I refer especially to the 53d chapter of Isaiah: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way: and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all. . . . . Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul, or life, an offering for sins, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." Nearly every line in this passage is an affirmation of the substitutionary death of Christ, but the word translated in the 10th verse AN OFFERING OF SIN, is one which alone suffices to settle the question in dispute. It is ASHAM, the term always employed in the Mosaic law to denote a TRESPASS-OFFERING. The explanation of it given by Gesenius is a "sacrifice for transgression, by which particular faults or sins were expiated." Surely this should be satisfactory.

I will enter on the third argument in another letter, having already trespassed sufficiently upon your space. I hope the infinite importance of the subject will appear as an excuse. With all good wishes, believe me, dear brother Storrs,

Yours, very truly, EDWARD WHITE.

Camden Town, London, July 16, 1854.

POST MASTERS.—There are some of this useful class of men who are a discredit to the name. We have at several different times had letters from them with notices to discontinue the EXAMINER. To prevent fraud, we have adopted the practice of returning these Post Office notices to the subscriber, in a sealed letter, paying the postage ourself. In nearly every instance we have found the Post Office statement false. One Post Master was a Methodist, and did not *feel* to let his neighbors read the EXAMINER; but his deeds came to light by our returning his letter to the subscriber. A few days since we received one of these Post Office notices to *discontinue* the EXAMINER, and immediately returned it to the subscriber, stating that we had sent the paper regularly. We received the following letter from that subscriber in reply. We omit the names, in hopes that we shall not need to expose such Post Masters, *personally*, though they ought to be called upon to pay for their delinquencies.

———, July 28th, 1854.

Mr. Storrs:—The Post Master's notice to you to discontinue sending the BIBLE EXAMINER to me was received yesterday, with your note thereon, which is the first knowledge I have had of its being sent. After subscribing for it, I called at the Office three or four weeks in succession, and was told that there was none there. On the receipt of the notice to discontinue, which you returned to me, I went to the office and called for the numbers that had been sent and was told that they had been "*tore up*" and otherwise disposed of. "Reason, not taken." However I do not wish to have it discontinued as there is now some prospect of obtaining the numbers that may hereafter be sent.

Respectfully yours.

"THE DISCUSSION."—Prof. Mattison has furnished us with another article, but it came too late for the present number. We were in hopes to insert a part of it, but found we could not without laying over the article from our English Correspondent—Br. White—which was received *before* the Prof.'s However, our readers may expect it, with our reply in the next EXAMINER; which will be issued as early as possible.

PALESTINE.—We commend the following recent account of famine in that country to the attention of those who too fondly represent it as returned to its primitive fruitfulness. We ought to guard against fanatical representations on this and all other subjects. A calm waiting on God and following His providence, when it clearly indicates His will, is the only true ground of action, as it is also the only safe one. We have seen fanatacism enough about Palestine as well as some other topics. The account referred to of famine in the land of Judea speaks thus—

"FAMINE IN THE HOLY LAND.—Recent letters from the venerable city of Hebron, calling upon Sir Moses Montifeore for relief, say that the land of Judea is 'consuming its people,' that 'the dearth which prevails is unparalleled in the annals of the country. Failing harvests are superseded by drought, so that the face of the earth is literally scorched, and the wail of the famished multitudes is heard by day and by night, and our streets are thronged with starving children, who vainly implore for food.'"

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our circumstances render it necessary that we should make a statement of the fact that it is impossible for us to issue the EXAMINER more than once each month for the four next months; and even this will be done with considerable embarrassment to ourself.

Our proposition, made in November last, was—"If we receive one thousand dollars by Dec. 25th, from subscribers or otherwise, we will publish TWICE each month, at $1 per year." Up to January FIRST we had received but little over HALF that sum; and the WHOLE AMOUNT received, from subscribers, up to the PRESENT TIME is only about $900. The composition, press-work, and paper for 24 numbers of the EXAMINER varies very little from $800; add to this $100 for office rent, and $900 is the result. In this estimate, it will be seen, we have made no account of our labor, and our time has been almost exclusively devoted to the EXAMINER. We have done very little at publishing other works; and what we have done in that line, this year, has no more than barely met the expense, by the sales, if that; and the sale of other works has been less this year than last, while our expenses have much increased.

Our friends responded most nobly at the time of our loss by fire, for which we still hold them in grateful remembrance. About $100 of that money went to replace paper for the EXAMINER, destroyed by fire. We have house-rent to pay for our family residence, which is not a small item in and about New-York; then we must have bread to eat and raiment to put on.

Now, we ask our patrons, considering the amount of our receipts, and our necessary expenses, shall we wrong any of you if we give you for the next four months, ONE EXAMINER per month, instead of TWO? That will give you a volume this year of 20 numbers, as rich, to say the least, as any previous numbers ever published. We regret the necessity of thus curtailing, but see no way to avoid it. We hope to resume the semi-monthly issue in January, 1855, but this will depend on the patrons of the EXAMINER. We cannot issue it but once each month, unless we have at least as many paying subscribers at the COMMENCEMENT of the year, as we now have. We have to pay more for paper than we did six months ago. Fuel and eatables, of nearly all descriptions, have gone up in price, till a poor man has to watch and pray much to obey the injunction, "Take no thought for the morrow." We feel no disposition to complain. It is not for ourself that we issue the EXAMINER. If two-thirds of our present subscribers renew their subscription, and get half as many more NEW ones by January 1st, we shall go on again SEMI-MONTHLY, if the Lord gives us life and health.

"A PROPHETICAL STREAM OF TIME: OR, AN OUTLINE OF GOD'S DEALINGS WITH MAN FROM THE CREATION TO THE END OF ALL THINGS: By Sir Edward Denny, Bar't."

This is a beautiful CHART five feet long and over two wide, opening with a luminous representation of an indefinite period before creation, inscribed "GOD IS LOVE;" and including the Hebrew word "ELOHIM." Below this, in the same luminous representation is a small ball, representing, it seems, "GOD'S PURPOSE" of Creation, then follows a picture of the globe, from which commences the "STREAM OF TIME," a representation by a perpendicular column, about one inch and a half wide, extending the whole length of the chart, from the Creation to the Milennial age, which is represented by another luminous scene, followed by the "little season," of the loosing of Satan, and then winds up with the new heaven and new earth.

On the Stream of Time is represented the principal events recorded in Scripture in the past, and the subjects of prophecy in the future. By a SIDE stream, issuing out of the main stream, is represented the call of Abraham. This side stream flows parallel with the main one, down to the crucifixion of Christ, where it terminates. The fortune of the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, is represented at various periods, down to the crucifixion, by marks running through this side stream, and into and out of the main one. The time of the establishment of the KINGLY government of Israel, is marked in the side stream by a CROWN: the passing away of that kingly power is marked by the transfer of the CROWN to the main stream, and Babylon appears at that point. "The present interval," from the cross to the Millennial age, is marked by a luminous eye, representing the Church of God on earth, looking down to another luminous representation in the Millennial age of the Church glorified. The work is accompanied with a "Companion to the Chart," and a a miniature chart, serving as a Key to a full understanding of the whole. Though we may not agree with its author in some particulars, yet the Chart and Companion are exceedingly interesting to such as have a taste for study by such helps.

☞ Eld. J. B. Cook, Rochester, N. Y., has imported some of them from England, in fine order. They are for sale by him, and also by R. T. Young, 140 Fulton-street, New-York. PRICE, of Chart and Companion, $7.

BIE

NO IMMORTA

VOL. IX.

PUBLIS

At N

TERMS

GEO. STORR

THE

"DOES THE B

MAN—WHICH TH

OF THE GROUN

CALLED THE SOU

The Affir

Mr. Editor:—

of a beloved da

earliest opportu

And first I must

reply.

1. Our reader

thus far you hav

fessor's Theology

saw fit. Neithe

in so many word

have taken it for

dox belief upon

man. Of this I

hand in the abse

your belief in de

that you was a

the entire system

you are constant

opponent for an

or twice alluded

own. But of thi

I would spare m

the editor of the

wish me to leave

walk through the

points by no mea

slaughtering his

drance. Howev

your sensitiveness

(extorted probat

the spirituality o

INTELLIGENCE IS

ANIMAL ORGANIZ

without bodies;

zation of man is

istence of the sou

think and feel the

2. You quote

purely spiritual n

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 1, 1854. NO. 17.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor:—Having returned from the burial of a beloved daughter at Oswego, I embrace the earliest opportunity to resume our discussion. And first I must notice a few points in your last reply.

1. Our readers have seen that in your responses thus far you have not scrupled to assail the "Professor's Theology" in a general way, whenever you saw fit. Neither have you waited for me to state, in so many words, what that "theology" was, but have taken it for granted that I held to the orthodox belief upon the subject of the immortality of man. Of this I do not complain. On the other hand in the absence of a formal creed, embodying your belief in detail, I have taken it for granted that you was a consistent materialist, holding to the entire system, the leading principles of which you are constantly advocating. And having my opponent for an example, I also, in turn, have once or twice alluded to your views, as opposed to my own. But of this you complain. You really wish I would spare myself "the trouble of stating what the editor of the Examiner holds;" that is, you wish me to leave the system untouched, while you walk through the "professors theology," assailing points by no means involved in the discussion, and slaughtering his "traditions" without let or hindrance. However, I have gained one point by your sensitiveness: we have now the concession, (extorted probably by the arguments respecting the spirituality of God and angels,) that "MIND OR INTELLIGENCE IS NOT, IN ALL CASES, THE RESULT OF ANIMAL ORGANIZATION." There are minds, then, without bodies; and therefore the animal organization of man is not essential to the continual existence of the soul. The mind may still exist and think and feel though the body be dissolved.

2. You quote my remark—"If there are no purely spiritual natures, how could such a nature be superadded to the material body of Adam;" and reply,—"We have not said any such nature was superadded, &c." Very true; neither have I *stated* or *implied* that you have said any such thing. If the reader will turn back to page 200 of the Examiner, he will see that I was vindicating the pertinency of my arguments, which you pronounced irrelevant, and simply showing that the spirituality of God and angels was an important point in the discussion. So your disclaimer on that head is altogether uncalled for.

3. You allege that if mind or intelligence is *not* in all cases the result of animal organization, it follows that all animals that manifest intelligence must have souls that will live after their bodies are dissolved. But do you not admit the premises, namely, that mind is *not*, in all cases, the result of animal organization? Do you really think, then, that quadrupeds, and birds, and fish, have immortal souls? Why, then, except man? Why not admit that *his* immortality follows, from your own admitted premises, as well as that of an elephant or a dog?

But I have not argued immortality from the simple circumstance of intelligence, but from the fact now admitted by you that mind may exist independently of animal organization. From *this* fact the immortality of beasts by no means follows; and besides, while it is expressly declared that "the spirit of man goeth *upward*," it is as explicitly declared that "the spirit of the beast goeth *downward* to the earth." Eccl. iii. 21. This plain scriptural declaration annihilates all your unscriptural inferences.

4. You refer to Luke 20: 35 36, and conclude if the risen dead are "equal unto the angels," the angels also must have bodies; that is, if in the resurrection they "neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can die any more," but "are equal unto the angels;" the angels must have bodies like them! Who does not see that the equality here relates solely to the two points stated, viz., that like the angels they neither *marry* nor *die*. To infer the materiality of angels therefore, from this passage is about as logical as to argue their resurrection from the same scripture.

5. You cite 1 Cor. 15: 47, "The first man is of the earth, earthy," to show that Adam had no spiritual nature superadded to his material body. But is it not written only two verses before, that "the first man Adam, was made a living soul?" And verse 46, "that was not first which was spiritual, but that which was natural; and afterward that which was spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy, &c." If Paul teaches that "that which is spiritual" is "of the earth, earthy," then "Bro. M. differs with Paul;" otherwise, the differ-

ence is between Paul and my friend of the Examiner.

6. In your next paragraph, we have a distinct denial of the spiritual nature of man. He has no "other nature than an animal one," and "there is no indication of any other or different life being imparted to man, than what was imparted to all other animals." Your logic is that all other animals *breathed* as well as Adam, and therefore they must have possessed all the life which he possessed. But is it even true that all animals breathe? Or is it written that God breathed into the nostrils of quadrupeds, and birds, and fish, and oysters, the breath of *lives*, and they became living souls? Why was he created so differently from them? Were these all made "in the image of God," as well as Adam? And why, if he was a mere animal, like the horse or the elephant did God say to him, "have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1: 28. And does not all this amount to even an "indication" that man has another and a higher life than the brute?

But we are referred to Eccl. 3: 19, "they have all one breath," &c.;—in proof that man is a mere animal. But a more unfortunate reference could scarcely be made. "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea they have all one breath; so that man hath no pre-eminence above a beast, for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again," Eccl. 3: 19, 20. "One thing befalleth them"—they all die. In this respect man has "no pre-eminence;" but, like the beast, must turn to dust. But least any should fall into the error of the Examiner, and conclude that the *spirit* of man dies and goes to dust, it is immediately added, "Who knoweth the spirit of man that GOETH UPWARD, and the spirit of the beast that GOETH DOWNWARD to the earth?" Verse 21.

Upon this verse, Dr. Clark, who knew something of Hebrew, observes, that "the word *ruach*, which is used in this and the *nineteenth* verse, has two significations, *breath* and *spirit*, and cites numerous passages in proof. And his literal translation of the passage is, "Who considereth the [*ruach*] immortal spirit of the sons of Adam, which ascendeth? it is from above; and the spirit or breath of the cattle which descendeth? it is downward unto the earth." How, then, with such a declaration before him, can any believer in the Bible assert that man has no spirit different from the brute? and that his whole being goes to dust like the beast that perisheth?

7. As an offset against the flaming capitals from Dr. PYE SMITH, respecting the import of Gen. 2: 7, I will give you the opinion of two Hebrew scholars, either of whom will more than balance the Doctor, even though printed in plain Roman.

JOSEPH BENSON says, "It is sufficiently implied here that the soul of man is of quite a different nature, and higher origin than the souls of beasts;" and DR. ADAM CLARKE says, "God breathed into his nostrils—*nishmath chaiyim*—the breath of LIVES, i. e., animal and intellectual. While this breath of God expanded the lungs and set them in play, his inspiration gave both spirit and understanding." See commentaries. And if you wish to settle the matter by citing authorities, I can furnish you several columns as flatly against you as the specimens here adduced.

8. You do well to "pass the Prof.'s pair of bellows," for if the breathing of the "breath of LIVES" into Adam's nostrils was merely inflating his lungs with air, as is often done in cases of drowning, or where animation is suspended, then any thing that would force air into the nostril, and lungs would answer the purpose. And as a bellows is often used for this purpose, and is well adapted, you have *nothing to say* against them; and do well to be silent. I repeat it, therefore, that upon your principles a bellows, and a man to use them, was all that was requisite to make the lifeless body of Adam "a living soul!" Pray answer this reasoning if you can.

9. You say Paul's inward man" was his "mind;" for he "saith nothing about his 'soul,' &c." Indeed; and does he say anything about his "mind?" What was his mind in your opinion? Was it any thing more than his animal life? And could that be renewed day by day" while he was "failing and growing feeble?" Pray tell us how, upon your principles the "mind" could be distinguished from the "outward man?" *That* is the point that needs explanation.

10. I regret that you did not find it convenient to notice all my proof-texts, one by one, instead of selecting here and there; but you may intend to notice the balance in your next. Allow me then to remind you that Isa. 31: 3, Num. 16: 22, 27, 1 Cor. 6: 21, and 2 Cor. 7: 1, by some means escaped your notice. They were formally cited as proof-texts, and I really hope they will not be dispatched by the simple assertion that they "just avail him nothing." Would it not be better to *show*, if you can, that they do not prove the point in reference to which they are quoted?

Having thus devoted all the space I can spare, to your response and criticisms, I shall now proceed with the direct argument.

I have already shown by numerous unequivocal proof-texts, that *the Scriptures every where recognize the philosophical distinction between the body and the spirit, and the two-fold nature of man.* I shall now proceed to show that in accordance with this principle *they uniformly represent death as a* SEPARATION *of the body and spirit of man.*

The original decree of death, Gen. 3: 19, implies only the death of the body. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." Here it is plain that only so much of man as was "dust" and "taken out of the ground" is doomed to return to dust again. But the "breath of lives" breathed into Adam by his Creator, was *not* "dust" nor 'taken out of the ground;' therefore it has no affinity for the material clod, and is not to return to the dust with the body at death. That this is the true meaning of the decree is obvious from every description we have had of *its fulfillment* throughout the Scriptures.

1. Take, for example, Eccl. 3 : 20, already cited. "All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." But *how* does man turn to dust? Does his *spirit* die or go downward to the earth? Nay, indeed. "The spirit of man GOETH UPWARD." verse 21. It is not "of the earth, earthy," and is not doomed to perish with the mortal body.

2. In Eccl. 12 : 7, we have a clear allusion to the original decree of death, and a striking description of the nature of its fulfillment. "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." "Then" —at death—"the dust"—or body, "shall return to the earth as it was." It could not "*return*" had it not been originally *from* the earth. So of the spirit; it "shall *return* unto God who gave it," because it was given by and eminated from God, when breathed into the body of Adam at the first. Then animal life began; and now when it becomes extinct, the spirit goes back to God who gave it.

3. Job. 34 : 15, "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." Here observe that the "spirit" and "breath" of man are two distinct things; and "when God gathers these unto himself" men "turn again unto dust." But the "spirit" does not return "*again*" unto dust, for it was never in the dust; and besides it is "gathered" by God "unto" himself,"—it "goeth upward" and "returns to God."

4. To the same effect is the very common description of death, as *the giving up of the ghost*,—a departure of the soul from the body. Of Rachel it is said, "And it came to pass as her soul was in departing, (for she died")—Gen. 35 : 18. "Abraham gave up the ghost," Gen. 25 : 8; "Isaac gave up the ghost," Gen. 35 : 29; Jacob "yielded up the ghost," Gen. 49 : 33; "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said this he gave up the ghost," Luke 23 : 46. "But man dieth and wasteth away, yea, man giveth up the ghost," Job 14 : 10; Sapphira "fell down and yielded up the ghost,"—Acts 5 : 10. I shall spend no time with the peurile criticism that "*ghost*" in these passages means simply the *breath*. It is enough to know that both *ruach* and *pneuma* signify SPIRIT as well as *breath* or *wind*. It is worse than trifling, therefore, to assert that because they sometimes mean wind or breath, that therefore they mean nothing more when applied to the intellectual nature of man. The "ghost" is undeniably the spirit or soul, which returns to God who gave it when the body dies.

That death is a *separation* of the soul from the body is obvious from the fact that when Elijah prayed for the son of the widow of Zarephath, 1 Kings 17 : 21, that he might be restored to life, he did not pray for the child to be *roused from sleep*; or that his lungs might be inflated with air merely, but he said, "O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child's soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived." Here the "soul" had left the body, and was miraculously "superadded" to it again as the means of restoring it to life.

6. James 2 : 26, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." Here the apostle refers, for illustration, to a fact almost universally acknowledged in his day, viz., that a body was "dead" when it was "without the spirit;" or, in other words, that death is a *separation* of the soul and body of man.

7. "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." What does the apostle mean by "departing," and what by "abiding *in the flesh?*" Is he not obviously speaking of death? And is not *living* to "abide in the flesh," and *dying* to "depart?" Besides, how could he be *with Christ* after death, if his whole being went down to silence and corruption? Pray reconcile such scriptures, if you can, with the principles of materialism.

8. 2 Cor. 5 : 6, "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord. We are confident I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." What does Paul here mean by "at home in the body," and "absent from the body," if the soul and body are not essentially distinct; and if death is not a separation of these two natures? What materialist would ever employ such language, in reference to himself, on the event of death? And how is it that Paul was "absent from the Lord" while "at home in the body," and must be "absent from the body" before he could be "present with the Lord?" Is not the obvious meaning simply this; that before death he could not be with Christ, who had "passed into the heavens;" but at death, his soul would leave the body and ascend to heaven, there to be present with Christ, forever.

9. Precisely such was the hope of the first martyr. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." He was now looking "steadfastly into heaven," where he saw Jesus "standing on the right hand of God." What, then, is the meaning of his prayer? Is it "Lord Jesus receive my *breath?* Or does he mean "receive my spirit *down in the dust?*" I hope the "Examiner" will *examine* these curious portions of the "Bible," and give them an interpretation consistent with his theory of no-soul-ism; or the death of the spirit of man.

With these sixteen stubborn passages, and the four that remain over from my last articie unnoticed, I shall rest the argument for the present.

New York, August 8th. H. MATTISON.

Response by the Editor.

We sympathise with Br. Mattison in the death of his "beloved daughter," and trust she "sleeps in Jesus;" if so, most assuredly, God will bring her from the dead—as He "raised up Christ"—"when the Lord himself shall *descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ

shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together *with* them in the clouds, *to meet* the Lord in the air: and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort* one another with *these words*:" 1 Thess. 4: 16–18.

To save space and to avoid repetition, in our response, we again adopt the method of referring to the point to which we respond by the quotation of the *number* of his paragraphs.

"1." The Prof. "does not complain" that we "assail" his "theology in a general way," because we "have taken it for granted that" he holds "to the orthodox belief," &c. We thank him for this concession that we have not mistaken his position. On the other hand we are in nowise responsible for what he calls "a consistent materialist:" we are a *Bible* materialist; and believe that "the Lord God formed *man* of the *dust of the ground*," and gave life to that man in the way the scriptures affirm; and not by superadding another entity called the soul, which the Scriptures nowhere affirm. The Prof. is mistaken in supposing that any argument he has used has "extorted" from us "the concession" he supposes. We said expressly, "we *never* uttered such a sentiment" as that "Mind or intelligence is, in *all cases*, the result of *animal* organization." It was no new position with us—no concession to anything the Prof. had said. But upon this supposed concession he triumphantly exclaims—"There are minds, then, without bodies!" Here he has jumped at a conclusion that by no means follows. Are there no other *bodies* except "ANIMAL" ones? Are there no organizations except ANIMAL ones? Sure our friend is too much in haste in his conclusion. Does not Paul speak of "a SPIRITUAL body?" and, does he not do it in contrast with the ANIMAL organization, or body? And does not the apostle as distinctly state that this "spiritual body" is to be at the resurrection, when "this MORTAL shall have put on immortality?" See 1 Cor. 15: 44–54. "Flesh and blood"—or an ANIMAL organization—"cannot inherit the kingdom of God," saith Paul. What then? Just this: we must have SPIRITUAL bodies: not "minds without bodies,"—to use the Prof.'s language. Had Paul believed so, he had no need to spend so much labor to prove the resurrection, and the change from natural, or animal bodies to spiritual ones. Because there may be, and will be spiritual bodies, or bodies not of animal organization, it does not follow that mind can or does exist without any body. "The ANIMAL organization of man is not essential to" his "continued existence;" but can the Prof. show that man has another entity called the soul? and that IT can think and feel without any bodily organization, whatever? In this paragraph he has ASSUMED, as usual, that such an entity does exist.

"2." Whether our "disclaimer" was "uncalled for" is purely a matter of judgment, and we let the Prof's remarks on it pass.

"3." The confusion the Prof. has introduced here, by a misstatement of facts, needs unravelling. We have made no such ALLEGATION as he assumes. The Prof. said, in his previous article—"I affirm that mind or intelligence is NOT the result of animal organization, and that therefore the soul does not become extinct at the death of the body." To this we replied—"Thus he ASSUMES that man has an entity called 'the soul,' instead of proving it, and if his affirmation" [that mind is NOT the result of animal organization] "is true, all animals, which manifest mind or intelligence, as CERTAINLY as man, have souls that do not become extinct at the death of their bodies." When the Prof. made the foregoing affirmation we understood him to say, that in NO CASE is mind or intelligence the result of animal organization. If he did not mean that, then he admits that mind or intelligence may exist without a superadded entity called the soul; and hence, mind or intelligence in MAN is no evidence of the presence of such an entity: but if he did mean—as we supposed and still think—that mind is in NO CASE the result of animal organization, then our conclusion from his premises inevitably follows, unless he can demonstrate that animals have NO mind or intelligence. Our Prof. seems anxious to change the issue from the question in hand to that of the immortality of the soul. That question may come up if our friend ever succeeds in proving the affirmative of the one in debate. The fact is, we said not one word about "the immortality of beasts;" but the Prof. argued the existence of a distinct entity in man, called the soul, from the fact that man has MIND or intelligence. Our reply is, if that fact proves man has such a soul, as is in dispute, it equally proves that all other animals as certainly have such souls. How does the Prof. meet this unanswered and unanswerable argument? He does it by saying—"I have not argued immortality from the simple circumstance of intelligence," &c. Did he not argue the existence of a distinct entity in man, called the soul, from the circumstance that man had mind or intelligence? We think our readers all so understood him: and we do not wonder he should shift to the question of IMMORTALITY; but when that question comes up—if we ever reach it

—we shall see whether he is more successful in his labor. Let the Prof. remember we said nothing of the immortality of beasts, because we intend to keep to the question at issue in this discussion. What he has said on Eccl. 3 : 21, does not touch the question at issue at all. If his construction of Solomon's language is admitted, it does not prove that man has a distinct entity, called the soul, any more than the beasts, or that there is any conscious survival in death. Solomon speaks of the SPIRIT of the beast as well as that of man, and uses one term for both. If this text proves man has such a soul as the Prof. affirms, it equally proves the beast has : the only difference is in the DESTINY of those souls. But, we desire to know by what Scripture rule he uses the terms spirit and soul as synonymous? Where is his authority for it? On Eccl. 3 : 21, we shall speak at large when we come to the point where the Prof. urges it more fully.

"4." On the text Luke 20 : 35, 36, we only gave a "hint," without affirming that angels "have bodies like" the resurrected ones ; yet it will be very difficult for the Prof. to prove that the reason why the resurrected ones neither marry, &c. is not because they are bodily conformed to the angels, so that such a relation as marriage, is impossible in the very nature of their state ; and we know the resurrected ones will have some kind of bodies ; hence the organization may be included in their being "AS the angels"—Matt. and Mark—or "equal," or like, as Luke has it, notwithstanding the Prof.'s demurring at the idea.

"5." Our citation of 1 Cor. 15 : 46, 47, to show that Adam had not a SPIRITUAL nature, at his creation, seems to have put Br. M. in difficulty. He wishes to know if it is not "written only two verses before, that the first man Adam was made a living soul?" Truly, Prof., it is even so ; and that is the reason Paul assigns for the statement he made in the previous verse, VIZ. "There is a NATURAL body, and there is a SPIRITUAL body," or as the Syriac has it—"There is a body of ANIMAL life, and there is a body of the spirit."—Prof. Murdock's Translation, Syriac N. T. To prove that man was possessed of an animal nature only, at his creation, Paul selects a phrase from Gen. 2 : 7, which is alike used as expressive of the LIVING condition of man and all animal creation—"The first man Adam was made a LIVING CREATURE." The whole account of creation shows this to be the sense introduced by Moses and appealed to by Paul. The Prof. or ourself, is in sad confusion on the 46th verse in Paul's argument. "That was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural ; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy," &c. Now, saith the Prof. "If Paul teaches that 'that which is spiritual' is 'of the earth, earthy,' then 'Br. M. differs with Paul,' otherwise the difference is between Paul and my friend of the Examiner."

Truly this is the most remarkable theological development we have seen lately. If there is any force in this EXEGESIS, [shall we so call it?] it is intended to make the impression that "that which is spiritual" is THE SOUL, which the Prof. affirms was superadded to the man Adam. Now did the apostle speak in that direction? Paul saith—"The FIRST MAN is of the earth, earthy : the SECOND MAN IS THE LORD FROM HEAVEN." He saith, also—"The FIRST MAN, Adam was made a living soul," or creature ; "the LAST Adam was made a quickning spirit." This last Adam, Paul declares, is the Lord from Heaven and the SPIRITUAL person to whose "image" men must be made conformable, and should be made so by the resurrection, if they "sleep in Jesus." But our Prof. if we understand him, makes the SECOND man—the last Adam, the Lord from heaven"—to be the distinct entity, called the soul which the Lord God created "afterward" and put into the man formed of the dust of the ground, thus constituting the spiritual part of man ; and he adds—"If Paul teaches that that which is spiritual is of the earth, earthy, then" he "differs with Paul."

Surely, it is no evidence that a man's theological views are "heresy" because they differ from most other men ; therefore, should the Prof. be right in this NOVEL exposition, it turns out that Paul was all along talking not of Christ, and HIS SPIRITUAL NATURE, which he would impart to those who believe on him—so that they shall be "partakers of the divine nature,"—but he was informing the Corinthians how they became possessed of that distinct entity called the soul! But we submit the query—Did Paul speak of anything pertaining to Adam THE FIRST when he spoke of that Adam which is SPIRITUAL? Did he teach the SECOND or "last Adam" was united to the first, at his creation, constituting the one man created? If this "last Adam" was united to the first, at creation, then it follows that "the soul, superadded" to the creature man, was the "LORD FROM HEAVEN!" for such Paul affirms the "last Adam" to be. Thus, at last, we have the mystery solved—THE SOUL IS "THE LORD FROM HEAVEN!" Then it follows, there is no such thing as sin, or the Lord from heaven sinned! and there is no such thing as moral corruption, or the Lord from heaven is

morally corrupt! There is no such thing as man's soul being unreconciled to God, or the Lord from heaven is thus unreconciled to God! And in the work of redemption the Lord Jesus Christ only redeems the Lord from heaven! But we forbear to press this point to its full and legitimate result. We shall be glad if the Prof. disclaims the intention of making the "last Adam" the spiritual nature superadded to the first Adam, at creation. We are unable to put any other construction on his words than that we have commented upon.

Man's spiritual nature, Paul teaches us, IS NOT by Adam the first; but is the result of being "in Christ," the last Adam, and is derived from him, as our animal nature is derived from the first Adam. The spiritual nature is of grace, through faith in the last Adam—the head of the NEW creation, so that, "if a man be in Christ, he is a new creature"—literally, A NEW CREATION: 2 Cor. 5: 17. But this new creation is not perfected, or exhibited in its fullness, till the resurrection from the dead, of which Paul is speaking, 1 Cor. 15. Paul does not teach that "that which is spiritual is of the earth, earthy;" but he does teach that in order to be possessed of THE SPIRITUAL we must "bear the image of the heavenly;" or, of the last Adam, the Lord from heaven, and be raised from the dead to incorruptibility and immortality.

"6." Does the Prof. deny that animals live by BREATHING? Not exactly; but he insinuates that some do NOT breathe! It is an undeniable matter of fact, that the animal creation, so far as we know, did LIVE by breath in their "nostrils;" and do still live in the same way. If the Prof. can prove that "oysters," &c., do not live in that manner, it does not affect our argument; for it is still a fact that animals were created before man, and that the general law of life was that of living by breathing; thus at the flood, "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every MAN: ALL in whose NOSTRILS was the BREATH OF LIFE"—margin, "the breath of the SPIRIT of life." Thus it is clear that men and animals had life by one common principle, VIZ., by breath in their nostrils; and that God breathed that life into the nostrils of them all, in one and the same way is a "self-evident truth," unless the Prof. can show that he used a "pair of bellows" in the case of the beasts. Some things are certain—the beasts lived by BREATHING—so did man. Man's breath was in his nostrils—so was that of the beast.

That men and beasts are not capable of the same intellectual development is wholly owing to their peculiar organization, so far as we have evidence to guide us on the subject. The fact that man was made to have dominion over fish, fowl, cattle, &c., so far from proving that he "has another and higher life than the brutes" indicates just the contrary. Man was of the ANIMAL FAMILY; but with an organization which enabled him to develop intellect far superior to any other animal; hence was placed at the head of this family to govern it, or exercise dominion over it. With his superior capacity for intellectual development he was made capable of being placed under a law given verbally, by which a moral character might also be developed; of which other animals were incapable. All this neither imports nor implies, much less proves, that man had "another and a higher life than the brutes;" but it does import, that he was by his superior organization, qualified to govern, or have dominion.

Our reference to Eccl. 3: 19, is not so "unfortunate" as the Prof. may think; his reference to Dr. Clarke notwithstanding. We do not think Solomon had so lost all wisdom as to contradict himself in the short space of three verses; and Dr. Clarke admits the word [RUACH] translated BREATH, in verse 19, is the same that is translated SPIRIT in the 21st. And why does he ASSUME that RUACH means "the immortal spirit," in verse 21, while the same term means BREATH in the 19th verse? The reason is obvious—His CREED demanded it! and so does Prof. Mattison's. But there is no reason for it in the text or context. To talk of Dr. Clarke's "literal translation" of this text is to show one of his WEAK points. We will translate it on his principle and see how it will read:—"Who considereth the [RUACH] immortal spirit of the sons of Adam which ascendeth? it is from above; and the" [RUACH] IMMORTAL "spirit or breath of the cattle which descendeth? it is downward unto the earth."

Now then, "the cattle" have "immortal spirits" as well as men, if the Doctor's license may be taken as a pattern: for, it is undeniable that the same term [ruach—spirit] is used in relation to both man and beast in verse 21; and there is not the least expression in the text or context to warrant the Doctor's assumption that in the one case it means an immortal spirit and in the other breath. If Dr. C. or Prof. M. can take such liberties with the text, they must not blame us if we pronounce it an unwarranted assumption, doing violence to the text, and context, making Solomon to mean

just what his entire discourse shows he did not mean. To Dr. Clarke's assumption we might oppose Martin Luther's reading of verse 21: "Who knoweth WHETHER the spirit of man goeth upwards?" &c. Macknight and several others have taken the same view of the text. This rendering is supported by the Septuagint and Vulgate; and the argument of Solomon demands such a construction of the language. Solomon is enforcing the doctrine of the frailty and mortality of man—not teaching his immortality. Having affirmed that "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" in death, he adds—"All go to ONE PLACE: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Does he in the next verse convict himself of falsehood, or folly? Does he deny that "all go to ONE PLACE?" No: he does no such thing—The text is a CHALLENGE for any one to disprove his view of the destiny of man and beast at death; or to show that he had misstated the fact of man's lack of pre-eminence above the beast.

"7." As an offset against" Drs. Clarke and Benson we "will give" the Prof. an extract from the Methodist Quarterly Review for April 1852, p. 248. The writer, Dr. Bagnall, in his attempt to prove the soul immortal, says,

"Some have supposed that the account of the creation of the soul, given in Gen. 2: 7, contains an intimation of its immortality. If there be in this verse such an intimation, it must be found either in the expression, 'the Lord God . . . breathed into his nostrils,' or in the phrases, 'breath of life,' and 'man became a living soul.' If it be in the former phrase, then the idea is that God infused a portion of himself, of his own divinity, into the human body at that time. But few will admit this idea. Most of us think that there is more poetry than truth in the line of one of our hymns: 'Our souls are his immortal breath.' If the proof is sought in the phrases 'breath of life,' and 'living soul,' these do NOT PROVE ANYTHING; for both of them are applied, in the first chapters of Genesis, to brutes and prove the same thing concerning them. Thus the words in Gen. 7: 15, and Gen. 1: 20, rendered LIFE, are the same with those rendered in Gen. 2: 7, 'a living soul.'"

Here is an honest confession and a true one; and it was not made to support a CREED, as were those of Clarke and Benson. But Dr. Clarke AFFIRMS without proof, and Benson says, it is "IMPLIED." Ten thousand assumptions without proof, and especially in opposition to facts, such as Dr. Bagnall states, amount to nothing in argument where men seek to have a faith founded on evidence.

"8." Again we might pass the Prof.'s "bellows," by simply saying, there was NOT "a man to use them" till the Lord God made one; and He so made the first man in his procreative powers, that there has been no occasion to use "a bellows" since; except, perhaps, in case of death by suffocation; when, sometimes, his "bellows" might be employed to advantage. Various examples could be given, but one may suffice as an illustration. A boy was drowned—life was extinct. He was taken from the water and carried LIFELESS into a store near by. The doctor applied heat and stimulants, and breathed air, or breath, into the boy's lungs; by continuing this process, the child's breathing returned and he became a living soul again. Will the Prof. tell us, if he thinks the doctor, in this case, breathed an immortal soul, or a distinct entity called the soul, into this boy? Or, did the application of heat and stimulants to the lifeless body, and breathing into the lungs bring the boy's soul-entity back from heaven or hell? If so, let not the Prof. despise "a bellows," for its operation might be much more effectual than he imagines. If the blood was coagulated and cold, such an effect would be produced with great difficulty. Thus it is evident that the development of life depends on the state of the material organization, and the introduction of breath to put the blood in motion, and not the superadding an entity called the soul. We would invite the Prof. to examine Dr. Adam Clarke's notes on the case of Elisha's restoring a child to life, 2 Kings 4: 34—36.

"And he went up, and lay upon the child, and put his mouth upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes, and his hands upon his hands, and he stretched himself upon the child, and the flesh of the child waxed warm. Then he returned, and walked in the house to and fro, and went up, and stretched himself upon him: and the child sneezed seven times, and the child opened his eyes."

Dr. Clarke, on the expression "LAY UPON THE CHILD," says, "Endeavored to convey a portion of his own natural warmth to the body of the child; and probably endeavored, by BLOWING into the child's mouth, TO INFLATE the lungs, and restore respiration." That is truly almost equal to a "pair of bellows," Prof., is it not? Dr. Clarke proceeds on the expression, verse 35, "WALKED IN THE HOUSE TO AND FRO," to say,

"In order, no doubt, that he might recover that natural warmth, which was absorbed by the cold body of the child; that he might again, by taking it in his arms, communicate more warmth. CALORIC, or natural heat, when accumulated in any particular part, will diffuse itself to all bodies with which it comes in contact, till their temperature be equal. The body of the prophet gave out its natural heat, or caloric, to the cold body of the child; the prophet, no doubt, continued in contact

with the child till he could bear it no longer ; then he covered up the child, rose up, and WALKED SMARTLY on the floor, till by increasing the circulation of the blood by activity and strong and quick respiration, he could again afford to communicate another portion of his natural heat."

Thus the Dr. reasons like a philosopher, and reasons truly. But to suppose the prophet did all this to get the theological soul back from heaven, is to suppose he acted insanely. If the breath of a "pair of bellows" could have possessed the same vitalizing heat as the breath of the prophet, doubtless, Prof., it would have answered the same purpose.

We have introduced this case simply to show that our Prof.'s insisting on his "bellows'" argument avails him nothing. Turn which way he will, the sword of truth cuts his beloved theory to pieces. The Lord God breathed into the lungs, through the nostrils, of THE MAN, He had formed of the dust of the ground, the vitalizing breath, which caused the circulation of the blood ; and by this means, or process, man became a living soul, or creature. That is the plain unsophisticated sense of the Mosaic account of man's creation ; and let any man beware of ADDING to the words and testimony of God in the matter. We take the account as it stands, and abide by it ; though men may sneer at us, and call us "infidel." We say to all such, "Physician, heal thyself." They are the real "infidels :" they do not believe the testimony that "the Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground." They affirm that was NOT man, but only an inferior and comparatively unimportant PART OF man. They must settle their assumption with their Maker : our skirts shall be clear, if our testimony against such assumptions can make them so.

"9." The "animal life" is NOT "the mind ;" but mind is the result of a LIVING organization. There is hence no difficulty in "distinguishing" it FROM the "outward man." If any child cannot distinguish a result from the cause he needs further instruction.

"10." None of the Prof.'s "proof-texts" escaped our "notice." The only "proof-texts" he gave us we did notice, and show—as we think—they were no proof at all that there is a distinct entity superadded to man, called the soul. The texts not particularly noticed relate to "spirit," which term we showed is not synonymous with "soul" in scripture usage ; and hence until the Prof. can show these terms are interchangeable or synonymous, ten thousand texts that speak of "spirit" do not prove the AFFIRMATIVE of the question at issue. Why did not the Prof. "find it convenient to notice" our objection to his using these terms, as he has, without divine authority? And why did he not "find it convenient to notice" our remarks on his quoted text from Job 14 : 22, and Zech. 12 : 1? We beg him, and the reader, to turn to pages 204–5, in the Examiner for July 1st, and see if we did not give a good and sufficient reason for not noticing ALL his texts, in detail. We did "SHOW that they do not prove the point in reference to which they are quoted ;" and that they do not touch the question at issue.

The Prof. having used SIX-TENTHS of his space in replying to our previous response, says, "I shall now proceed with the direct argument ;" but, strange to tell, he has abandoned the question at issue entirely ; and he is now going to show that "DEATH" is a "SEPARATION OF THE BODY AND SPIRIT OF MAN." We have shown that in scripture usage the terms SOUL and SPIRIT are not synonymous, or words of the same import. The Prof. has not seen fit to reply to us on that point at all, not even to express dissent to our view of their scripture usage ; and yet he now starts off with the assumption, that if he can show death separates the BODY AND SPIRIT of man, then THE SOUL must be a distinct entity superadded to the creature man which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground! We might justly say, then, the Prof. has abandoned the ground he was pledged to defend, and seeks to draw us out of sight of the true issue. But we shall not let him off in that way. Let him own his defeat, or establish the fact, from scripture usage, that SOUL and SPIRIT are words of the same import. Till he has done this all his appeals to texts that speak of SPIRIT, just avail him nothing in support of the affirmative of the question under discussion. If we follow the Prof. then, "in his erratic driftings"—to use a phrase of a Methodist tract—it is not because we are under any obligation to do so by the question at issue ; but to show how theologians of his school deal in generalities, assumptions, and the sound of words to which they have attached a theological sense not warrranted by scripture usage ; and then having drilled that sense into the minds of the young, they have only to quote words, and the theological sense of those words passes current with those who learn their theology by ROTE, and not by searching the scriptures to see if these things are so, as did the "noble Bereans," when Paul preached.

What the Prof. saith about the "original decree of death" implying "only the death of the body," because it was only what came from dust that was to return to dust, is a grand explosion into his

own theological camp; for if that "decree of death implies ONLY the death of the body" it CANNOT include the "MORAL death" nor the "ETERNAL death"—meaning endless misery—of which his theological school so often speak; so we may consider that settled so far as the Prof. is authority; and for once he harmonizes with the Bible. But he says, "The breath of lives, breathed into Adam by his Creator, was NOT dust, nor taken out of the ground, therefore it has no affinity for the material clod, and is not to return to the dust with the body at death."

Pray who has ever said the breath of lives will return to dust? But when MAN is deprived of the breath of life HE—THE MAN—the "THOU"—returns to dust: the same THOU who was forbidden to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil—"THOU shalt not eat of it"—"THOU shalt surely die"—"Out of the ground wast THOU taken—dust THOU art—unto dust shalt THOU return." That means "ONLY THE BODY" does it? Well then, the fancied entity, called the soul, was not forbidden to eat—was not threatened—did not sin—did not die, but was very kindly taken out of that WICKED BODY by being "separated" from it: and as it cannot by a possibility have sinned, on the Prof.'s theory, the threatening of death did not relate to this imaginary soul, but "ONLY the body," therefore the said soul cannot justly suffer punishment unless it is placed under some other law—of which we have no account in Adam's case—and violates that other law. This is making some advance in divinity, but is seems towards universalism; or, more properly, towards the doctrine of "Spirit Rappers," who maintain all souls gain by death. Is it not, in fact, an admission that no such soul as he contends for was possessed by Adam? So it seems to us.

We now proceed to notice the texts which the Prof. adduces on this point, and again refer to them by quoting his numbers, as before. We wish it, however, distinctly remembered that we regard him, as having left the question at issue, and that we follow him only out of respect, and for the reason we just mentioned.

"1." His reference again to Eccl. 3: 20–21, does not help him, unless he can show that GOING UPWARD is proof of a distinct entity called the soul. If he could do that, even then he must further prove that GOING UPWARD is conclusive evidence that it is alive, for a great many things go "upward" that are not alive, and sometimes the "vanity" of the thing is that which carries it in that direction. But the Prof. has yet to prove that Solomon ever said the "spirit of man goeth upward" at death. See our remarks under the previous number "6." Yet another difficulty stands in the way of the usual theological view of this text. If the spirits of all men go upward at death, and are conscious, then they do not, at the same time, go "DOWN to hell." The theological hell is not UPWARD but DOWNWARDS; and as Solomon makes no distinction in the direction the spirits of men take at death, based on moral character, the conclusion is, according to the Prof.'s view of this text, that they all GO UP TO HEAVEN. If he, or any of his school, say—"They do all go up there to be judged and then go down to hell"—we reply, That is a pure assumption, unsupportaed by a single text of scripture, and makes void the word of God, involving the grand absurdity of judging the wicked at death and sending them to the theological hell, and hundreds or thousands of years after, bringing them out and judge them again to see if they had been sent to the right destination.

"2." The Prof.'s appeal to Eccl. 12: 7, is equally unavailing in support of his side of this discussion, unless he proves the spirit and soul are identical; and that the spirit is a distinct superadded entity; neither of which has he yet made manifest. Besides, he must prove that it is "the spirit" of THE MAN that Solomon speaks of in this text; and if that could be established he has made no approach towards sustaining the assumption that it is a living entity. It "returns to God who gave it;" and as certainly to the same condition or state it was in before it was given, as that the dust "returns to the earth as IT WAS" previous to the creation of man: that is, THE MAN is dissolved: the spirit of life is withdrawn, and all life and sense ceases.

"3." We are glad the Prof. next introduces Job 34. 15, because it will serve to help understand Eccl. 12: 7. The Prof. ASSUMES that the spirit spoken of, Job. 34: 15, is man's spirit. Elishu is the speaker. He had said, chap. 33: 4, "The SPIRIT OF GOD hath made me, and the BREATH of the Almighty hath given me life." The same speaker saith, chap. 34: 14–15, "If he [God] set his heart upon MAN, if he [God] gather unto Himself His spirit, [by which He "MADE me," or made man,] and His breath; [by which He "hath given life;"] all flesh shall perish together, and MAN shall turn again to dust."

The spirit and breath are God's spirit and breath, by which He made man and endowed him with life. If He withdraw these to Himself again, MAN turns to dust, like "all" other "flesh;" so

saith Solomon, Eccl. 3 : 20 ; and 12 : 7, expresses the same sentiment. "The spirit" that "returns unto God" is that spirit of God which "formed man of the dust of the ground," or "MADE" man. When God withdraws this to Himself, MAN dies and returns to dust. But if we were to admit that it is man's spirit that is spoken of, here is no proof that it is an entity—a distinct being from "MAN," of whom it is expressly said, HE "shall turn again to dust."

"4." We now come to "GHOSTS." The Prof. has introduced a little Hebrew and Greek, and we presume he will not blame us for introducing the same. The case of Rachael will first be attended to, as nothing is said about GHOST in the text. This case would be available for Prof. M. IF he had made out the soul a distinct entity, which he has not done. He assumes that the term SOUL is here used for a distinct entity. The original word signifies, necessarily, no more than "LIFE, ANIMAL BREATH:" See Prof. Pick's Bible Student's Concordance, word "soul." Prof. Bush puts this passage in the class of texts where the original term is used "in the sense of Life, the vital principle;" and remarks—"this might doubtless as properly have been rendered LIFE, which is said to DEPART at death," &c. Bush on the Soul, p. 31. Prof. M. cannot object that Prof. Bush, or Prof. Pick, were tinctured with the views we advocate, for they were not ; yet as scholars they gave the sense of original words. Prof. Pick is a Hebrew by birth. But leaving both these men, the text requires this interpretation and forbids that of Prof. M. Look at it. "As her soul [LIFE] was in departing, (FOR SHE DIED.") HER and SHE, in the text, are expressive of her personality. That personality "died;" its life departed ; SHE was dead. Here is the plain, unsophisticated sense of the term, and it gives no countenance to the Prof.'s "affirmative."

We now come to his *ghosts*. We examine that point in relation to the Hebrew, or Old Testament, first. The Prof. says—"I shall spend no time with the puerile criticisms that *ghost* in these passages means simply the *breath*. It is enough to know that both *ruach* and *pneuma* signify *spirit* as well as *breath* and *wind*," &c.

Here are two assumptions. 1st. We know of no one who pretends that the term generally used for ghost, in Hebrew, *ever means breath*. The puerility, therefore, on this point is found in the Prof., not in us. His second assumption is, that "*ruach*" is the Hebrew word translated *ghost*;—this is not true ; so the *puerility* again returns on himself. We do not claim much knowledge of Hebrew, but we may be permitted to inform Br. M., that Prof. Pick gives us *gova* as the Hebrew word translated *ghost* in nine cases out of the eleven in which the term occurs in the Old Testament. The two exceptions are in Job 11 : 20, and Jer. 15 : 9, where the expression is "*nophakh-nephesh*," the literal meaning of which, he says, is—"*Breathed out the breath.*" In the other nine cases he gives the literal sense of "*gova*," to be "*wasted away.*" "The ghost," therefore, is not "undeniably the spirit or soul," as Prof. M. affirms ; and it will require something more than a "puerile criticism" to sustain him in his baseless assumption that it means the "spirit or soul." These texts, of the O. T., have a beautiful and forcible sense by a literal translation, according to Pick. "The years of Abraham's life" were "a hundred three-score and fifteen. Then Abraham *wasted away* and died in a good old age." How natural. "Ishmael" lived "137 years ; and he *wasted away* and died." "Isaac" lived "180 years ; and Isaac *wasted away* and died."

There is one text we notice more particularly, viz : Job 14 : 10. The term *man* occurs twice in this verse. The first time its original, according to Prof. Pick, is "*Gever*, man of strength, or strong man :" in the last part of the verse it is, "*Odom*, man of earth." The phrase wasted away, in the first part of the verse is not in Hebrew *gova*, but "kholash—is *weakened* and dieth."—And the marginal reading is, "*is weakened*, or, *cut off*." So that the text literally read, according to Prof. Pick, stands thus, "But the strong man is weakened and dieth ; yea, the man of earth *wasteth away*, and where is he?" The Septuagint reads the verse thus—"But a man that has died is utterly gone ; and when a mortal has fallen he is no more."

To rely on such an expression as *ghost* to prove the "creature man—formed of the dust of the ground—has a superadded entity, called the soul," demonstrates the "puerility" of an effort in that direction. The Prof.'s appeal to the New Testament helps him just as little. The Greek word translated Ghost, in relation to the Spirit of God, is *Pneuma ;* but is, as Dr. Adam Clarke contends, improperly translated Ghost, and should always be translated Spirit. This point, however, we need not dwell upon, as it does not touch the question at issue. The term translated *ghost* in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5th, to which our Prof. appeals, is *not* pneuma ; so here again he stumbles. The original word, Acts 5 : 5, 10,

rendered *ghost*, is, *exepsuxe ;* "ind. act. of *ekpsucho*," which signifies, "to breathe out; to faint; to expire; to die:" See Pickering's Greek Lexicon. The text is simply—"Ananias fell down and *expired*," or "*died*." Sapphira "fell down and expired," or "died." There is nothing said of their "spirits" or "souls" in the text; much less anything to countenance the popular idea of a *ghost*. An appeal to this text, then, gives no support to the Prof.'s affirmative, and is evidence of his utter lack of proof. To assume that *pneuma*, even, is a distinct entity, and of the same import as soul, and meaning the same thing, shows to what straits the popular theology drives its advocates. *Pneuma* is never used for soul in the New Testament, but *psuche ;* and neither of them ever express the idea of a distinct entity separated from man in death. Prof. Murdock—who is on the orthodox side—in his translation of the Syriac New Testament, which he says, is "the oldest version of the New Testament in any language," gives us the following translation of the last clause of verse 46, Luke 23,—"Thus he spake, and expired:"—not, "having said thus, he gave up the ghost," as in our translation.

"5." The Prof.'s appeal to Elijah's raising the widow's son, 1 Kg. 17: 21, is equally unavailing. That the child's *soul* came into him again is a truth; but that it was the theological soul of our friend Mattison, lacks proof. Does the Prof. wish to know what came into the child "*again*"? We answer—the same that went *out* of him. What was that? The 17th verse will tell him. "His sickness was so sore, that there was *no breath* left in him." What did Elijah pray to have "come into him *again*"? The "*nephesh—life, animal breath*," which is the *literal* meaning of the word according to Prof. Pick. When that *breath* returned the child "revived:" and Elijah said to the mother, "thy son liveth." He was dead, but is alive again; not by the return of an escaped "superadded entity," but by the breath returning to its office of acting on the lungs and blood.

"6." Here, as usual, the Prof. assumes that soul and spirit are identical. Besides, no such spirit as the Prof. contends for, is referred to in the text; and our translators honestly put *breath* in the margin, which is manifestly the apostle's meaning—"As the body without the *breath* is dead," &c. No help in this text for our friend's *affirmative*.

"7." The appeal to Phil. 1: 23, 24, is equally unfortunate for our Prof.; because Paul saith not one word about "the *soul*" in this entire epistle; nor about its being with Christ at death; a very strange omission, truly, if he believed he had such a distinct entity. Nor does the term *spirit* occur but twice in this epistle, and in neither case does it favor the "affirmative" of the question at issue. He exhorts the Philippians to "stand fast in *one* spirit," and immediately adds, "with *one mind* striving together for the faith of the gospel." To *assume*, as the Prof. has done through this entire discussion, that *soul* and *spirit* are synonymous terms, is assuming the whole question instead of proving it. And it is remarkable that he has not given us even the semblance of an argument in support of the identity of soul and spirit, as a Scripture usage. We have shown that the Scriptures are adverse to his usage of them.

The Prof. asks us, on the text Phil. 1: 23, 24, if the apostle is "not obviously speaking of death?" when he expresses "a desire to depart and be with Christ." We answer, *No*. Paul has everywhere, and on all occasions, represented *death* as *undesirable*, and to be avoided if possible; and hence speaks of a "*translation*, not to see death," as a great and peculiar blessing: See Heb. 11: 5.—He represents Christ, "in the days of his flesh," as "offering up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death," &c. See Heb. 5: 7–9.—Again, the apostle, speaking of a time when he "despaired of life," saith—God "delivered us from so great a death;" tho' he met the trial, he tells us, "trusting in God which *raiseth the dead*:" See 2 Cor. 1: 8–10. He gives no hint that if that "great death," which he feared, had come upon him he would have gone as a *dis*-embodied soul to be with Christ! No, he looked to God's *raising* the dead as his hope; and in 1 Cor. 15: 32, he had expressed the same sentiment, after speaking of the exposure of his life, and his liability to a violent death, he adds—"What advantageth it me if the dead rise not," &c.

Paul everywhere, then, represents death as *undesirable;* and hence that was not what he *desired* in Phil. 1: 23. Furthermore, Paul, in the 2nd chapter, in speaking of the sickness of Epaphroditus says—"He was sick nigh unto death: but God had *mercy* on him," and restored him. But, "Paul, had you not just said, you desired to die and be with Christ, and that it was far better to die than to live? How then can you say, God had *mercy* on Epaphroditus, thy brother and companion in labor, to bring him back from being with Christ when he was so *nigh* unto death? Did not

thy brother desire to be with Christ as well as you?"

Might not Paul have been justly thus questioned, if he had believed *death*, instead of the resurrection, introduced him into the society of his Lord and Master? Whatever then the apostle means, by his desire to depart and be with Christ, he cannot mean that death would introduce him, or "his soul," there; and the whole Epistle shows that no such sense can be attached to his words in the 1st chapter, as the popular theology assumes. Instead of saying a word about "his soul" in the text, or in the epistle, he urges "the resurrection from the dead" as the great point for which he labored and suffered; and the hope of it as being that which sustained him in prospect of death :—See chap. 3 : 8–11. This resurrection, he informs us, he expected when Christ shall come "*from* heaven;" at which time, he tells us, Christ "shall *change* our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body:" See chap. 3 : 20, 21. His hope was centred at that glorious point, or period, and not at death. Death he regarded as "a curse"—an "enemy"—from which he expected to be delivered—not by a fancied "reunion" of two entities—"soul and body"—but by a "resurrection from the dead."

Paul's desire then to depart and be with Christ can have no reference to the state between death and the resurrection. It was not a *hope* of being with Christ at death; for hope is made up of desire and *expectation*. Paul expresses a desire to depart and be with Christ, but saith nothing of an expectation of being with Christ till the "vile *body*" is changed and made like to Christ's.—Hence Paul's desire to depart and be with Christ was not a desire to have a *dis*embodied presence with Christ, but must have been a desire for *translation*, like Enoch and Elijah, which was better than either to live in this state or to die. If he could have a translation, that he should "not see death," he would prefer that to death; and thus to depart and be with Christ was a matter of innocent "desire;" but he expressed no expectation that his desire would be granted. Indeed, what follows shows he did not expect his desire to be granted; hence he labors to have part in the "resurrection," and looks for his change when Christ shall come *from* heaven.

"8." On 2 Cor. 5 : 6, as before, the Prof. *assumes* that Paul is speaking of "the event of death;" and asks—"What Materialist would employ such language in reference to himself on the event of death?" We, in turn, ask—What sane man—to say nothing of his inspiration—would use "such language in reference to himself on the *event of death*," when he had a short time before given the same people a long and strong discourse on the resurrection from the dead, and declared, "if the dead rise not * * * then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;" and asked them the searching question—"If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what *advantageth* it me, IF THE DEAD RISE NOT?" and added—"Let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die?" Thus plainly telling the Corinthian church, if there is no resurrection from the dead there is no hope of a future life, and we had best make the most of this. See 1 Cor. 15 : 16–18, 32. But if our Prof.'s view of the subject be true, Paul is now made to tell the same people that it would have *advantaged* him if the beasts of Ephesus had killed him, even if the dead never rise; for, his "unclothed soul" would have been *immediately* "present with the Lord," where he "desired" to be! Such "confusion worse confounded," we may be sure, the great Apostle of the Gentiles never was guilty of, tho' some men, called "orthodox," are.

The apostle had expressly said, verse 4, "Not for that we would be *unclothed*:" he desired no such state as that. What then did he wish, or look, for? Answer—To be "clothed upon, that *mortality* might be SWALLOWED UP OF LIFE."—Will mortality be thus swallowed up till the resurrection from the dead? Let the same apostle answer, 1 Cor. 15 : 54 : "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this *mortal* shall have PUT ON *immortality*, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is SWALLOWED UP in victory." That is, *when* mortality is "swallowed up of life," and not "on the event of *death!*" and the apostle tells us it takes place "at the last trump;" "for," saith he, "the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed:" 1 Cor. 15 : 52.

Thus, whatever else the apostle may mean, 2 Cor. 5 : 6, he does not teach that a theological "soul" was to be separated from his "body and present with the Lord" *at death*. It is manifest enough what he does mean, when we look at his whole teaching of that church. He had told them, 1 Cor. 15 : 50, that "flesh and blood"—or *corruptible* man—"cannot inherit the kingdom of God:" he had told them "there is a spiritual body," verse 44; that this spiritual body is the resurrection one, verse 42; and he had said to

them, 2 Cor. 4: 14, "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall *raise up us also* by Jesus, and present us with you." Then, after dwelling briefly on our present perishing and corruptible state, he speaks of the glorious truth, ch. 5, which he had so much dwelt upon in the previous epistle, viz: that though we die, and are left in an unclothed state for a time—or in a *dissolved* state—yet, ultimately, "mortality" should "be swallowed up of life;" and by faith "we know" God will give us such "a building," and that it shall be "eternal," and not like our present mortal state where "we groan being burdened, waiting for the *adoption*, to wit, the redemption of our *body;*" not for "the event of death," but deliverance from death: See Rom. 8: 23. The apostle's absence from the body, then, is, manifestly, a deliverance from *mortality*, having it "swallowed up of life," which he did not look for till the last trump—till the resurrection—or till the return of Christ "*from* heaven:" till then he did not expect to be "present with the Lord." While in our mortal state, whether clothed or unclothed, i. e., alive or dead, "we are absent from the Lord." But when Jesus returns from heaven, and raises his dead saints, and changes his living ones, *then* will they have their "eternal house," and be for ever "absent from" the "mortality" through which they had passed. Such was the glorious prospect which Paul held up to the minds of those to whom he wrote: and such a view is consistent with all he said and wrote; but on the opposite theory, Paul is represented as uttering the most palpable contradictions, such as none but a traditionated man could utter. Strange, indeed, if Paul believed the Prof.'s notion, that, on none of these occasions which the Prof. has cited, he ever even mentions the word "*soul*," the important *fixture* in the Prof.'s theory.

"9." The Prof. having closed his last remarks by assuming that Paul taught, "at death his *soul* would leave the body and ascend to heaven," &c., says, at the opening of No. "9," "Precisely such was the hope of the first martyr Stephen." If Stephen had such a hope, he saith nothing about it; for he saith not one word about "*his soul*," nor any other soul. And the Prof.'s assumption that soul and spirit are identical again appears. Whatever the term spirit means in Acts 7: 59, it remains for the Prof. to show that it is that "superadded entity called the soul" he has attempted to affirm.

If we were dying we could utter the same language that Stephen did, most fervently: fully believing that all our future life depends upon our Lord Jesus, who has promised to *raise up* his followers "at the last day." Till then, and in the confidence that Jesus will fulfil his word, to whom should we commit ourselves but unto him whom God hath appointed as *the head* of the church—the members of Christ's body. The phrase "my spirit" is only a strong expression for *me*, or *myself*. Thus Mary says, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour." The plain sense of which, is, *I myself, Mary in person*, do these things. So the sense of Stephen's language is clearly this, "Lord Jesus, receive, or *accept, me*." As though he had said—"Lord Jesus, I suffer, I die for thy name, for thy truth—here I am, an offering unto death upon *the altar* for thy cause—*accept me*—receive this sacrifice of myself." It is then recorded—"When he had said this *he fell* ASLEEP:"—not, "his *soul* was then taken up into heaven;" but *he*, the personality, Stephen, fell asleep—and he will doubtless sleep till the Lord Jesus, who did "receive" his offering of *himself*, shall call him from "the dust of the earth," where he now rests.

The Prof.'s fling at our "*no-soul-ism*," as he is pleased to call it, will pass for its worth. We believe in a *soul* and *the soul;* but we do not believe in a distinct "entity, superadded to the creature man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground"—*theologically* "called the soul:" and our Prof., in our judgment, has utterly failed to establish his "affirmative;" but our readers will judge for themselves in the matter. We wait to hear what further he has to say.

EXERCISES OF THE MIND.—We select the following, exchanging the term *spirit*, in the original, for *mind*, which we regard as far more appropriate and expressive.

Praise I take to be the most sublime exercise the mind is capable of; *prayer*, the most beneficial; *faith*, the most vital; *love*, the most godlike; *watchfulness*, the most continuous; *self-denial*, the most difficult; *resignation*, the most becoming; *zeal*, the most arduous; *purity*, the most habitual; *humility*, the crowning exercise of all. It throws a sacred halo around, a sweet comeliness over the whole Christian character, and gives each feature its full prominence, and every grace its richest and most glowing tints.

And *what* are these exercises you place such importance upon?—*Praise*, I take to be the elevation of the *mind to* God; *prayer*, the activity of the *mind with* God; *faith*, the recumbency of the *mind on* God; *love*, the outgoing of the *mind after* God; *zeal*, the operation of the *mind for* God;

meditation, the absorption of the *mind in* God; *purity*, the moulding of the *mind like* God; *watchfulness*, the position of the *mind toward* God; *self-denial*, the framing of the *mind after the will of* God; *humility*, the beautiful covering of the *mind from* God,—the "raiment of needle-work," the "fine linen, white and clean."

But who among the *best* have yet ascended the highest rounds of *praise*, or sounded the vast depths of *humiliation*, or completed the intermediate grades of Christian excellence?

From Wm. Murrels, California.

Br. Storrs.—The "Bible Examiner" is indeed a welcome visitor. It is as a friend of light in this land of moral darkness.

I notice with regret, that you have been visited with the hand of misfortune in the loss of your property by fire. I sympathise with you in the affliction, and accompany this with a small amount, to help you bear the loss.

You might be desirous to know someting of religious feeling in this far off land; that is, as viewed by one who thinks and looks at matters in the same light as yourself. There is no (pure) religion in this morally dark land. There is an indefinable impression amongst the majority, of the existence of a Supreme Being, but there are few who believe, or care to know anything about Jesus Christ in the light of a Saviour. It is amazing what rapid strides infidelity and atheism is making over the minds of the masses. As regards the advent of Christ, and the resurrection of man from the dead, very few here have any conception of either. Those who make pretensions to Theological attainments, don't conceive them to have any existence in reason or revelation. So exalted is man's nature, in their opinion, that to contradict his natural immortality is tantamount to proclaiming your own insanity. Men gaze at you with wonder when you question that cherished dogma. It is difficult to get any one to converse with you on the subject, or even to read the Scripture testimony relating to it.

It makes the heart bleed to see whole communities, who with justice can boast of high intellectual acquirements, be so slavishly blind to those of all things the most important.

In my intercourse with the very few whom I had the privilege of conversing on the great subject of immortality, I found one colored man, a minister, who was not trammeled with educational bias, or sectarian bigotry.

It is next to impossible to reach the mind with anything pertaining to morality or religion. Men are so engrossed and deluded with the magic scenes of this "*Vanity Fair.*" Indeed, one must use much watchfulness and care, not to be himself carried along with the mighty current.

Churches are becoming numerous, elegant, and well attended. But they belong to the nation, and not to Christ. They contribute to each others prosperity and aggrandizement.

The papers you kindly put in my charge, when I left New York, I distributed variously. I parted with many amongst the passengers on the way out. They created considerable interest and discussion. Of the latter I had my share. Amongst the disputants was a minister of the Methodist order. He argued fair, although wedded to his opinion. Some good impressions were made I have no doubt, but alas, California life soon dissipated them, I am persuaded.

Matters in the old world look ominous. They are no doubt introductory to the great consummation. May it hasten it in its time.

THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.—We give place to the following with considerable reluctance. We exceedingly dislike to *seem*, even, to beg help from any who probably have just as many difficulties to get along as we have. It is a time of trial with nearly all our brethren, so far as our knowledge extends. A few seem to be prospering, and if such feel disposed to help us, they may be assured none will be more grateful than ourself.—Originating, as this proposition does, from a location where we are best known, it is grateful to our feelings as a token of continued confidence from those where we resided and preached from 1844 to 1852.

—

Dear Br. Storrs:—Will you give the following an insertion in your paper and oblige your friends in *Philadelphia?*

PHILADELPHIA, AUG. 21st, 1854.

JOHN FONDEY, M.D.
JACOB GRIM.

—

To the Brethren and Sisters scattered abroad throughout the United States:—*Dear Brethren and Sisters:* we see by the last EXAMINER that our Br. Storrs, who is laboring in the good cause, not for himself but for others, by the return made unto him for his paper, gets but a sufficient sum to pay back again the amount spent upon the paper. This is doing business without compensation, and business of that kind will not sustain him. Now as he has a family to maintain, it is evident to our minds that he must turn his attention to some other branch of business, or get help from some other source; for our part we are not willing to see the EXAMINER fail, or the Editor labor for naught. We would like to see the subscription price raised full double what it is at present: but that he is unwilling to do: so we would propose another mode. There are some thousands of friends in the United States; and we would like to see some five hundred dollars per annum, at least, as a permanent help, raised for his support, so that it might be a permanent thing. There are a great many persons who profess to sympathize with us in our views, yet they spend all they have to spare in helping support some fine *church*, with its fine edifice, and high-living *minister*.—Yet they are willing to sympathize with Br. Storrs, and leave him to live on *faith*. This should

not be so. We would propose that each person raise or lay aside one dollar per annum to help Br. Storrs. If they cannot afford that, let them spare what they can. We would not even limit it to one dollar, others may give more if they have it to spare, but we want it a permanent thing.—One Brother in Philadelphia has given his name to begin with, for five dollars per year, as long as his circumstances remain as they are at present: and I will take five instalments at five dollars per year. Now we would like to dispose of about one hundred shares of this stock at five dollars per share: it will pay a good interest. The dividend is a consciousness of doing our duty in this life, and the promise of more in the future.

We think that we are rating our Brethren and Sisters very low if we have not one hundred in the United States that can afford to give five dollars per year; it is not quite ten cents per week;—many waste more than that: and then how many are there that can afford to give one dollar per year (two cents per week) or fifty cents per year, (one cent per week).

We are rather poor at financiering, but we would like to hear of Br. Storrs getting the help. We do not care how it gets there. If Br. Storrs' labor is not worth *ten dollars* per week, then we suppose the right value is placed upon his talents and time in the profits he gets for his paper—*Nothing*.

Friends, it only wants us to think for a few moments about the matter, and ask ourselves where does his living come from? He gets nothing from his paper—he gives all his time to the *paper* and preaching, and now how much do each of us give? This is the question to be answered; and then how much can we give?—and how much will we give? Then send it along, and the interest will be paid; if not now, in the Kingdom of Jesus Christ.

Yours, in Hope of an interest in that Kingdom,

JACOB GRIM.

—

Edward Archer's Appeal.

Dear Brethren:—Although a stranger to most of you, I wish to say a few words in relation to the financial condition of the BIBLE EXAMINER. I, in common with yourselves, am interested in this matter. Br. Storrs has only about nine hundred paying subscribers, which is only sufficient to pay printing expenses, to say nothing of remunerating him for his services. Now, if we wish the EXAMINER continued we must make up our mind to lend a helping hand. Bro. Storrs should have at least six hundred dollars, which I think, we can easily raise, and that too without entering into any of the movements resorted to by our popular churches, such as Festivals, Ladies' Fairs, Religious Lotteries, &c., all of which means are unbecoming christians, and totally at variance with that scripture which says—"Let him that giveth give with simplicity." I met a Brother, who is much interested in the cause, and one who has done a great deal for it. He said to me, "Something must be done, or the EXAMINER cannot be published *semi*-monthly." We looked at each other an instant in silence, as if cogitating in our own minds what we should do, when he said, he would double his subscription. I immediately responded, that I would do the same. Well, said he, try what you can do, and we parted. Now, I thought, if the two's and three's that are scattered throughout the land, would only come together, and resolve to do the same thing, how easy a matter would it be to raise a thousand dollars. But we can do more than this. Suppose each one of us pledge ourselves for two dollars, and then go to work in earnest and get two new subscribers, which would be better both for ourselves and the cause; for in that case, we should not only raise eighteen hundred dollars, but we would be laying the truth before eighteen hundred, and perhaps three times that number of readers; but it is altogether probable that some of us may get three or four new subscribers. I pledge myself for two, and hope to get more. And now, brethren, the plan is before you, in all its simplicity, go to work at once—in earnest—and we hope by the time the next EXAMINER is out, we may be enabled to give a good report of our efforts to Brother Storrs.

Yours for the cause of Truth.

E. ARCHER.

Washington Heights, New York City.

From Wm. C. Metcalf, Holden, Mass.

Br. Storrs.—Though less prompt than some in the discharge of my duty to yourself and the holy cause with which you are identified, I have not forgotten you.

It was with deep regret I heard of your loss by fire, and of your inability, for want of pecuniary means, to have an assistant to aid you in your arduous labors.

If all who hold the like precious faith with yourself would "lay by as God has prospered them," and forward the same to your care for the promotion of the truth, it would involve no sacrifice on the part of its friends, while it would, at once, place you in a position to labor still more efficiently in opening the eyes of the blind, rescuing the truth of God from the rubbish of human tradition, and publishing the glorious fact—"CHRIST THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE."

It is with sincere pleasure that I hail the "EXAMINER;" fraught as it is with messages of love, instruction and encouragement to the humble seeker after truth, who, in these days, is called to endure the *coldness* and *pity*, if not the *scorn* and *desertion* of those by whom they were formerly *cherished* and *beloved* both in the *flesh* and in the *Lord*.

Go on, dear Brother, giving "line upon line, and precept upon precept." May the Great Head of the church, raise up, through your instrumentality, a multitude, who shall rejoice in, and exhibit the glorious doctrines, connected with the Life theme.

My father, William Metcalf, sends three dollars, to which I add other three; making six dollars, which please accept as a slight expression of our interest in the cause.

RECEIPTS to aid the *Prov. Com* in balancing its Treasury.—William Webster $1; Andrew Hall $1.

From Richard Corbaley, Plymouth, Ind.

Br. Storrs.—The old fabulous doctrine of inherent immortality is losing ground here, and the doctrine of no immortality out of Christ, and no future life without a resurrection from the dead is gaining, and those who endorse the latter doctrine are generally persons of candor and who have a fair biblical knowledge.

Yesterday for the first time I saw a tract written by N. D. George, a Methodist minister, which is designed, or purports to be, an answer to you on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and its attendant dogmas. He is decidedly down on materialism, and in treating upon this subject he has certainly entangled himself so that he cannot be extricated without crippling some of his *immaterial* props.

The cause of truth is steadily on the advance in Northern Indiana.

Yours in the hope of immortality at the coming of Christ. August 16th, 1854.

From John C. Kennau, Hanover, Conn.

Br. Storrs.—It is with feeling of thankfulness to that God who only hath immortality, who has opened my eyes to behold the truth, and enabled me to receive it with my heart, that I can call you Brother. When I wrote for the Examiner I was under conviction, but being deeply prejudiced against this beloved doctrine of the advent faith, and blinded by early teaching, I resisted long and with a stubborn will; but the truth will prevail; and I am this day glorying in the hope of immortality when our Lord shall come.

There are a few names of us here who daily rejoice in this blessed hope, and try to stay up and encourage each other to be faithful and hope unto the end.

Charles D. Ridgeway of Paterson, N. J., fell asleep, Aug. 10th, in the faith of a resurrection to life eternal, through Jesus, "at the last day." He was educated at Princeton College—was for a time in the practice of Law and Surrogate at Paterson. He was by natural constitution mild and kind: this prevented his ever embracing a religion which he supposed taught the doctrine of endless sin and suffering. Some three or four years since his only brother—William Ridgeway—who had been long a prominent and active member of the Methodist E. Church—was led to embrace the doctrine of "Life and Immortality only through Christ." This revolution in William's mind led Charles to serious and careful inquiry, which resulted in turning him from Universalism, to which he had been strongly inclined, to faith in Jesus as the Resurrection and the Life. He was one of three who visited us soon after our removal from Philadelphia to New York, in 1852, with an urgent request to visit Paterson. From that time till his death we visited and preached in that city about once each month, and always found him deeply interested, and a firm supporter of the truth on the life theme. His mind evidently had undergone a great change, and he took a deep interest in the Bible. His sickness was short and extremely painful; but he bore it with patience. He was sensible that he would die: more so than his friends around him; but he assured all that he was not afraid to die. His mind rested on his Redeemer. He sleeps, we trust, in Jesus, and will live again when Jesus returns "*from* heaven." We feel his loss to the band of believers in that city. With his wife and bereaved children we deeply sympathise, and also with his only brother, William. May the Lord abundantly support and comfort them.

An Apology.—We beg our friends to excuse us *this once* for occupying so much space by our "Response" to Prof. Mattison in this number. It could not well be helped without seeming disrespectful to him, who appears desirous that we should not pass anything he offers. So far as our limits will admit we wish to accomodate him. We hope not to occupy so much room again: and we particularly regret it this time, because we have been obliged to *lay over* Br. Hudson's article and Br. Grew's response; both of which are on hand, and partly in type. We intend to give them the *first* place in our next issue, which cannot be till near the first of October.

An Offer.—To any minister, not already a believer in our views of immortality, we will send the Examiner for this entire year *gratis*, if he will inform us that he will receive and read it. This offer extends to 100 sets. Also, to any person remitting us $2, soon, we will send three sets for 1854.

The Editor of the Examiner will preach in *Paterson*, N. J., the first and third Sundays of this month; and in *Philadelphia* the second, or the tenth inst.; if the Lord will.

Donations since July 1st, to our aid.—Henry Grew $2; S. Royse $2; Wm. Murrels $10; Dr. Wynkoop $1; Freeman Dillingham $2; a friend $5; Wm. Metcalf $3; Wm. C. Metcalf $3; W. G. Warren $1; E. Crowell 50 cts; Amos Smith 50 cts; E. M. Smith $1; F. King $3; A. Pell $2.

The aforesaid Donors will each accept our thanks, and may be assured it has been to us *aid* in "time of need." May the Lord reward you all.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, OCTOBER 1, 1854. NO. 18.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Is the Soul a Distinct Entity?

AFFIRMATIVE BY C. F. HUDSON.

Dear Examiner,—Have just returned from absence for a few weeks. Have not time to prepare such an article as I could wish for your next number. But I should notice two or three points in review of the discussion thus far, and may add some exegesis of the passages oftenest adduced to support the negative of the question.

I find that my use of the word "immortal" in the number for July 1st, is misapprehended. I tried to make my meaning plain. I ask the reader to refer to the place. I said I "query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*, though I am sure the smaller number of human souls may be *actually* immortal." If this expression did not explain itself, the whole paragraph would make it plain. But Bro. G., without taking my meaning at all, asks, "if it (the soul) is naturally *immortal*, is it not naturally *indestructible?*" I simply answer, it can be of no use for us thus to talk at cross-purposes. If Bro. G. objects to *my use of terms*, he might offer his criticism accordingly, and I could defend myself by citing cases of a similar use of terms. But any *argument* of my friend, which mistakes my use of terms, proves nothing, and is a burden to both of us, and our readers too. Need I still further explain my use of terms to Bro. G.? I would say, then, that in the same way that I speak, and others have spoken, of the soul as *naturally* immortal, I would also say that a stout and healthy man is *naturally* long-lived; yet he may die prematurely, by accident, or as the penalty of crime. In this discussion I simply ask to be understood, and also to be met upon opinions which I avow, and not upon the opinions, or inferences, of others.

I had said that the question between us is not whether the soul is *conscious* during the intermediate state. Bro. G. asks "if the *proper* and *actual* existence of the soul, as a distinct entity from the body, does not *necessarily* involve its consciousness"? I might advise Bro. G. that he is philosophizing here, and ask for a "thus saith the Lord," that consciousness is involved, as he supposes. But I waive this. I intend to philosophize upon this point when I come to it, and shall ask Bro. G. to philosophize, or to reason, with me. It may appear that the *existence* of the soul, and its *consciousness*, do not keep pace with each other. Bro. G. asks, "Is that a distinct entity worthy of any man's advocacy, which has no knowledge, or thought, or affection?" I reply, were the mines of California worth anything before they were discovered? If Bro. G. is not ashamed to believe these mines were worthy to exist before they came to light, I am not ashamed of the idea of an unconscious soul. In my view, that existence is well worth while which makes my essential being the same in the life to come as in the present life, so that "*mine* eyes shall behold" my Saviour, and not another being in my stead. Such an intermediate existence, be it never so unconscious, I think I should value for what it accomplished. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." Can this death mean their temporary destruction and annihilation? Grant that the saints *exist* during the intermediate state, and this language is appropriate as expressing the care God has for them;—all the more appropriate, if their temporary, unclothed condition be one of disadvantage; but quite absurd, if it be a condition of non-existence.

There was great need that I should ask not to be misrepresented or misunderstood. In the Examiner for August 1st, Bro. G. speaks of the "felicity which, according to Br. H. immediately follows death." Where has "Br. H." said that? Did I not speak of the soul as "untented and unclad" in the intermediate state? Did Bro. G. read my remarks on 2 Cor. 5: 4? Is it not clear from these remarks whether I hold that "we are clothed upon with immortality at death, or at the resurrection?" If not, I will try hard to speak plainer hereafter.

I shall review several of Bro. G.'s comments before I close the discussion, as they come in my way. I only ask it to be here noticed that he distinctly admits that men "temporarily perish in death." And he accordingly says, in his remarks on Matt. 10: 28, that "man can destroy the soul or life *temporarily*, but not *eternally*." But such an exegesis makes nonsense of the warning our Lord designed to give. Men can kill the *body temporarily*, just as well as the soul. And they certainly cannot kill the body eternally, if the resurrection be a resurrection of *the body*, rather than a resurrection of *the dead*. If we accept Bro. G.'s exegesis, Christ did not speak clearly. He should have said, "Fear not them which kill the body temporarily, but are not able to kill the soul eternally," etc.

But even this limping exegesis is inadmissible

if we turn to Luke's account of the same discourse. "Be not afraid of them that *kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do*," chapter 12 : 4. In other words, they cannot kill the soul at all. They may do what they will with the body, but the soul is in God's keeping, and men cannot reach it. It awaits the resurrection and the judgment. Let your concern be not for the body, but for the soul.

As Bro. G. takes no exception to my list of his proof texts, I will proceed with a brief examination of them. The first is :—Gen. 3 : 19. "Dust thou art." The whole argument here turns on the use of terms. Now we are agreed, I think, that man is not *mere* body. Sometimes, indeed, we speak of a corpse, as a "dead man," or a "dead person;" but not as a "man" or a "person," unless we design to use these terms in an unusual sense. The body must be *alive* or there is no "man." We are agreed in this, though we differ on the question whether the life is a soul, or a distinct entity.

But on the other hand the life must be *embodied*, or there is no "man." For thousands of years past, people have thought and talked about souls, disembodied; very absurdly, Bro. G. thinks, very properly, as I think; but the point here is, the *common use of language;* and we know that disembodied souls have not been commonly *called* "men," though believed to exist.

According to common speech, then, the body alone, or the soul alone, is not the man. And yet the living man is continually spoken of and addressed with reference to the most different elements, as well as the most different qualities, of his being. Bro. G. understands the difference between a large man, and a great man. We say also that such a man was "beheaded," though it would be improper to say his life or his soul was beheaded. Again we say such a man was "anxious," though no one thinks of his body as being anxious. Thus we speak of men with reference to their bodies or to their souls, just as we have occasion. We say "nobody," meaning "no man;" and we say "fifty souls," meaning "fifty men." Thus we may use the terms "body" and "soul" at times interchangeably, though at other times such confusion would be absurd.

So in Gen. 3 : 19, man is called "dust," (*haphar*) though he was also *nephesh*, and was called *nephesh*, (breath, life, soul, self, or whatever the term mean,) quite as often as he was called anything else. And this *nephesh* certainly was neither dust, nor was it taken from the dust. And Bro. G. will not say that the *nephesh* returns to dust, unless he takes it to mean "blood," when he must re-explain Gen. 2 : 7,—to say nothing of Eccl. 12 : 7. But, for the purpose in hand, the doom to be denounced against Adam, he was well addressed as "dust," because the dissolution of the body was to him the most vivid picture of death. The *nephesh* need not be named in giving his sentence, 1st, because he may not have known or thought of its nature; 2dly, because the intermediate state, the judgment, and the second death, were yet to be revealed, and were unimportant to him. So much for the terms of Adam's doom. But afterwards, when the soul come into fuller consciousness, as a power within, energizing the body, and not a mere attribute of body, men must be told of death in fuller terms, as we have seen in Isa. 10 : 18, and Matt. 10 : 28.

Yours truly,

Cincinnati, Aug. 8, 1854. C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

I am sorry if I have, in any respect, "misapprehended" Bro. H. I trust that, by divine grace, it is our mutual desire not to "philosophize" or "reason" in any manner which is inconsistent with the revealed truth. "Let God be true." It is no marvel, if, in our continued discussion, some little misunderstanding of terms should occur. Let us forbear one another in love and patiently explain.

Bro. H. says, "I query whether the soul is not *naturally immortal*, though I am sure the smaller number of souls may be actually immortal." Now as the scriptures of divine truth so plainly teach that God will *destroy* the wicked, "soul and body," Matt. 10 : 28, I must still think it is of "use," to elicit truth, to ask, "if it, (the soul), is naturally *immortal*, is it not naturally *indestructible?*" In my view, this conclusion is unavoidable. How does our Bro. understand the declaration, God "*only* hath immortality?" Is not the import, that He only is *by nature* immortal? If so, it follows that no other being is *naturally* immortal. Moreover, I ask our friend, if he can establish the opinion, that the human soul is *naturally* immortal, by a single "thus saith the Lord," which he justly demands of us to sustain our faith? We have given him the divine testimony that man is "MORTAL;" that Immortality, (possessed naturally only by God himself) is the gift of God "through Jesus Christ," to be obtained by a vital holy union to Christ, and "patient continuance in well doing." If it is our natural attribute, we owe it, not to *redemption* but to *creation*. What is the holy record? It is "that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is IN HIS SON." Hallelujah! Bro. H. is "sure the smaller number of human souls may be *actually* immortal. "Does not this imply that he does *not* believe that all human souls will exist forever? Does it not imply that many souls may be destroyed forever? If our friend is correct in supposing that natural immortality may be forfeited, he is still bound to adduce some divine testimony that man was created immortal.

I asked "if the *proper* and *actual* existence of the soul, as a distinct entity from the body, does not *necessarily* involve its consciousness?" Bro. H. thinks this is philosophizing, and asks for a "thus saith the Lord." Of course, as I believe the opinion is a dogma of vain heathen philosophy, I do not suppose that the Lord has said anything about it, except to condemn all philosophy which is "not after Christ." Col. 2 : 8. I supposed, however, that the idea of "a distinct entity" of a disembodied spirit, or soul, and still think, that such an entity, destitute of all knowledge, thought, and affection, is unworthy of our advocacy. The gold in the mine undiscovered is not analagous. The gold *undiscovered* is intrinsically the same as when

discovered. An unconscious spirit is not the same as a conscious one. I supposed I understood my friend on this subject. He wrote—"The soul survives the first death, either by the law of its nature, or by some equivalent law which we do not understand." He now writes, "I am not ashamed of the idea of an unconscious soul." Can he then conceive of the soul *surviving* without consciousness? I assure my dear brother, I had not the least idea that I was misrepresenting him, when I inferred from his own declaration, that "*the soul survives the first death,*" that he believed that the "felicity (of the saints) immediately follows death." Are we now to understand him that the soul, as a distinct entity, survives without consciousness? If so, must he not admit that when man kills the body, he, in some sense, kills the soul also? Must he not admit with us that man can kill the soul in one sense, but not in another?

He remarks, "In my view that existence is well worth while which makes my essential being the same in the life to come as in the present life, so that '*mine* eyes shall behold' my Savior, and not another being in my stead. Such an intermediate existence, be it never so unconscious, I think I should value for what it accomplished." If any scriptural proof were adduced for such an unconscious intermediate state of 'a distinct entity,' we would not presume to affirm that it is destitute of 'value.' As no such proof is offered, I ask, what can such a theory accomplish more than a resurrection of the entire man from the dead? The period of unconsciousness is the same in both cases. In the latter, the life of the believer is hid with Christ in God, to be restored at the appearing of Jesus. "When Christ who is our life shall appear THEN shall we also appear with him in glory." *Then*, and not before, shall we see him and be like him forever. The glorious power of God, in the resurrection, will secure our "essential being" so far as conscious identity is concerned.

"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." It is asked, "Can this death mean their temporary destruction and annihilation?" Let the scriptures of truth answer. "And the Lord said, I will DESTROY man whom I have created from the face of the earth." Gen. 6 : 7 ; 9 : 15. The words destroy and destruction are used also in reference to the first death in the following passages. Gen. 18 : 23 ; Eccles. 7 : 16, 17 ; John 2 : 19 ; 1 Cor. 6 : 13 ; Ps. 90 : 3 ; 91 : 6. Several of these passages refer to the death of the righteous. All are pertinent. If the first death of the *wicked* is a temporary destruction, the death of the *righteous* is the same. They have no pre-eminence in this matter, abstractly considered, either over wicked men or beasts. Eccles. 3 : 19. That this death is not limited to a part of man—that there is no soul, or distinct entity which, as our brother affirms, "survives the first death," is most clearly proved by the plain declaration of the Eternal Spirit, that in that very day (of death) the "thoughts perish;" "also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished." The Savior's soul was in *sheol* (though not left there) where there is no work, or knowledge, or device. Eccles. 9 : 10 ; Psa. 16 : 10 ; and Acts 2 : 31.

"Grant that the saints *exist* during the intermediate state," our brother remarks, "and this language is appropriate as expressing the care God has for them—but quite absurd, if it be a condition of non-existence." I ask if the death of the saint may not be precious in the sight of the Lord, whatever view we may take of the intermediate state? I affirm that the promise of a resurrection to life eternal proves it to be so, notwithstanding the fulfillment of the decree, (plainly applicable to the entire man) "Dust THOU art and unto DUST shalt thou return." Has our brother never sung that God

> "Looks down and watches all my dust
> Till he shall bid it rise?"

Did he sing an absurdity? I trow not.

In reference to Matt. 10 : 28, I ask brother H., how we can reconcile the two scriptural declarations that man does kill the soul, and that man cannot kill the soul, except by supposing that he can kill it in one sense but not in another? I did not affirm that killing it temporarily, but not eternally, was the precise meaning of the Savior. Brother H. may reject my comment if he pleases. I will thank him for a better one. He must however give me one reconcilable with the plain and repeated declarations of the Bible, which we have adduced, that the entire man is subject to death.

On Gen. 3 : 19, our friend remarks, "The body must be *alive*, or there is no man." "We are agreed in this." Nay, my brother. If we were, we should both disagree with the spirit of truth, which pronounced the perfect material organism "formed—of the dust of the ground," to be "MAN" previous to the impartation of life. The testimony is not, that the organized dust *became man* by the impartation of life. It is, that by the simple impartation of "the breath of life," "man became a living soul." The organism was *man before.* God *breathing into the nostrils* made the man a *living* soul, or person—a *living* man. I seriously ask our brother to review this divine testimony of the creation of MAN, independently of all human theories. "The Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and MAN became a living soul." I submit the question to the intelligent mind of our brother—Is not the plain teaching here, that the perfect material organism, formed of the dust of the ground, with the breath of life in the nostrils, imparting animation to the whole frame, constituted the living man? Will he deny our affirmation, that there is not a single word here to warrant the notion of any entity distinct from the breathing living organism formed of the dust? Is it possible that the Spirit of Truth, giving account of the creation and constitution of man, should wholly omit that which constitutes the far more important part of Him? Alas! for the anomaly. That which the oracles of God denominates MAN, the wisdom of man denominates the mere *tenement* of man. Must not such wisdom be foolishness with God? Two marvellous errors demand consideration. The wonderful perfect organism formed of the dust by the omnipotent hand, and declared to be MAN, is reduced to a mere *tenement* of man; and the breath of the nostrils, which simply gave ani-

mation to the man, is exalted to a distinct entity of superior nature, capable of survivance when its tenement is dissolved! Thus has a heathen philosophy of an immortal soul nullified the revealed truth of God.

Our friend thinks "that disembodied souls have not been commonly *called*" men, "though believed to exist." The common sentiment appears to be that the disembodied soul is the *essential man*, who, at death, if a saint, goes to his reward. The Savior's parable is adduced to prove that the "rich *man*" is now in conscious misery. He remarks, "the body alone, or the soul alone, is not the man." Although the original term translated *soul* is, in the scriptures, occasionally applied to the mental powers, its proper import is *life*, and is often so translated, though not so often as it should be. I have proved from Gen. 2 : 7, that the material organism itself *is man*, who, by the breath of life in his nostrils, became a living soul or person.

Our brother correctly affirms in reference to the term "*nephesh*" that it "was neither dust nor was it taken from the dust." This however is no proof that it imports "a distinct entity," or an immortal essence of any kind. The learned believers in the natural immortality of the soul admit that the proper import of the term is "*breath*." We derive much confidence of the correctness of our views from the fact, that the word of the Lord, (the only reliable source of information on the subject,) contains, in the original, not a single sentence or word, warranting the opinion of man's possessing any "distinct entity" from the material organism, animated simply by the breath of life. Truly "Bro. G. will not say that the *nephesh* returns to dust." The breath of life, at death, "returns to God who gave it." It is no more a "distinct entity," or surviving conscious substance, *subsequently* to its leaving the body, or the man, than it was such an entity or substance anterior to its being given to the man. Eccles. 3 : 23, the same original word, *ruach*, is used to denote "the spirit of the beast" as is used to denote "the spirit of man." It is no more "a distinct entity" in the one case than in the other.

Our brother thinks that the subject of death was not fully revealed to Adam. I reply, that which was revealed to him on the subject is totally subversive of the opinion of our opponents. God threatened Adam in a manner to be understood. In no other sense could he understand the threatening, "THOU shalt surely die," than that *the entire man* should cease to live.. "Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt thou return." But this is not true if the nobler part, "the soul (as our brother affirms) survives the first death." The threatening in this case, was not fulfilled in the first death. Isa. 10 : 18, and Matt. 10 : 28, are referred to as revealing the subject of death "in fuller terms." The former is opposed to our friend's opinion, for it clearly represents the entire consuming of "both soul and body" at one and the same time. The other equally fails our brother's purpose, for *psuche* so far from importing "a distinct entity," means "the breath, vital breath, the vital principle." *Robinson's Lexicon.* This is the *primary* meaning. It suggests another and more unobjectionable import of the words of our blesssd Lord, which I submit for consideration, Man can kill the body, or the man, but cannot kill the *life*. He cannot destroy the principle of life. The vital breath returns to God who gave it. When God made man of the dust of the ground he imparted "the breath of lives" (Heb.) that mysterious principle which he imparts to entities or substancies as he pleases. This distinguished the animate from the inanimate. "Ye are dead," *i. e.*, liable to death; ye men, not a mere part of you, and "your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3 : 3, 4. How is the life of dead believers hid with Christ in God? If it is by the survivance of distinct entities, constituting the chief part of men, then certainly the *men* have never died. Our life, *i. e.*, its restoration, is secured "with Christ in God," and will be granted at his appearing who is "the resurrection and the life." Thus the word of truth connects our life with our resurrection.

May the Lord grant us understanding in all things.

Yours for the Truth,

HENRY GREW.

THE DISCUSSION.

"DOES THE BIBLE TEACH THAT THE CREATURE MAN—WHICH THE LORD GOD FORMED OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND—HAS A SUPERADDED ENTITY CALLED THE SOUL?"

The Affirmative by Prof. Mattison.

Mr. Editor.—It must be obvious to our readers that while you have no difficulty in noticing all that I may advance in the direct argument, it is impossible for me to notice all you say in review; much less in your rejoinders to my replies. Were I to do so, we might remain for months discussing points already raised, without advancing a step farther with the main question. This, I am sure, would not please our readers; and you have more than intimated in your last that I am devoting too much space to my Reviewer, and too little, comparatively, to the direct argument.

Accepting, then, your suggestion, I shall pass most of your last response unnoticed for the present, and devote most of the present article to the direct proof of the question in hand.

But I ought not to proceed without *some* notice of my Reviewer, even though I may not answer all your criticisms. For the sake of system, then, and to economize space, I will confine my present rejoinder to the *first part* of your last response; leaving your remarks upon my *new arguments* for future consideration.

1. You seem disposed to take back the virtual concession that there are minds in the universe without bodies. You mean simply without *animal* bodies. Do you then deny that "God is a spirit" without any body whatever?

But you seem to think the "spiritual body" of St. Paul is not an "*animal*" body. If by "animal" you mean *mortal* and *corruptible*, I agree

with you. The Apostle's "spiritual body," is a corruptible, material body, made incorruptible and immortal; but it is an organized body still. Such was the "glorious body" of Christ—"flesh and bones" still, though immortal! It is "THIS CORRUPTIBLE" which shall put on incorruption; and "THIS MORTAL" which shall put on immortality. And being invested with these two attributes of spirit—incorruptibility and immortality—it is no longer a "*natural* body," but a "*spiritual*" one. Like a spirit it can "die no more," and it is therefore called a "*spiritual body*." But it is nevertheless a *body*, and such a one as neither God nor angels have. It is of no avail, therefore, to cite St. Paul in proof that all spirits have "spiritual bodies;" and the point remains indubitably settled, (however fatal it may be to your materialism,) that spirits *can* and *do* exist without material bodies.

2. You insist that I have argued the existence of a soul in man, from the simple fact that he manifests *intelligence*. That may be a legitimate ground for such an argument; and I may use it hereafter; but I am not aware of having done so as yet; and as my arguments are all in print, would it not have been better to have *quoted* my argument than to meet my denial by a simple contradiction? If I have thus argued it will be easy to produce the argument: Will you please do so in your next response?

3. You object to my use of the term *spirit* in the sense of *soul;* but this objection is not well founded. Webster's first definition of the term "*soul* is, The spiritual, rational and immortal substance in man, which distinguishes him from brutes," &c.; and he also gives as one meaning of the term "*spirit*," "The soul of man; the intelligent, immaterial and immortal part of a human being;" and adds ["See Soul."] I have then, the authority of this greatest of English Lexicographers, for using the terms *soul* and *spirit* interchangeably as synonymous. That they are used synonymously in the Scriptures is certain. What was the "soul" of Rachel which departed, Gen. 35: 18, if it was not her *spirit?* And what is the "spirit" that returns to God who gave it, if it is not the *soul* that departs at death? Though each of those terms is used in other senses, (and how few terms have not more than one meaning?) still it is certain that they are also used in the same sense, to indicate "the spiritual, rational and immortal substance in man." It is vain therefore to attempt to destroy the force of my proof-texts, by asserting that the term "spirit" used in part of them does not mean the human soul! Such an attempt is a virtual concession that the Bible is against you; and that my arguments are unanswerable.

4. You devote a whole page to my twelve lines on 1 Cor. 15: 46, 47, and conclude that one of us must be "sadly confused on the 46th verse." I perceive this is the case, and must try and help you out of your confusion.

The general subject under consideration by Paul is the resurrection of the dead. The particular point in view is that introduced at the 35th verse, by the question, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" His answer is, *Firstly*, that the *death* of the body is no obstacle to its future life, verses 36–38: *Secondly*, that there are various kinds of flesh on earth, and that there are *celestial* as well as *terrestrial* bodies, 39, 40: and *Thirdly*, that following these analogies, the resurrection body will be "the same body" though raised in incorruption and glory,—a "spiritual body," verses 42 and 43. Then comes the affirmation, verse 44—"There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam *was made* a quickening spirit. Howbeit, that *was* not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven." Now my "exegesis" of these verses is this: To show that the dead, though corruptible and mortal, may be raised to glory and immortality, the Apostle refers to the different kinds of flesh—to bodies, celestial and terrestrial, natural and spiritual—and then, for illustration, and to show that the present corruptible state of man is no proof that he will not be incorruptible hereafter; cites the fact that man, at first, had only the natural body, without the soul, and afterward the *spirit* which gave it life. It is a simple reference to the creation of Adam, Gen. 2: 7, first the body and then the spirit; and we should like to know where else any thing like it "is written." Surely nowhere in all the Bible. We are shut up to this view of the subject, or to the inextricable confusion of the Examiner.

But with this understanding all is clear. The "natural" "WAS" first, (not *is to be*) and then the "spiritual." The first man—the *body*—is of the earth, earthy, the second man is "the Lord from Heaven," breathing the "breath of lives" into the lifeless body. The reference being to the history of the *origin* of Adam, the simple and obvious meaning is that his *body* is from the earth, and his *spirit* from God. So "it is written" Gen. 2: 7, and *no where else*. From this beautiful analogy the Apostle proceeds: First, the *body*, then the *spirit;* first the *natural* body then the *spiritual* body—first the *earthy*, then the *heavenly*. "And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." "THE DEAD shall be raised incorruptible," and the living shall "all be changed." Not *through faith* as you gratuitously assert, but *without faith;* for "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth," John v. 28; and "there shall be a resurrection of the dead BOTH OF THE JUST AND THE UNJUST." Acts 24: 15.

5. You wish to know if I deny that animals live by breathing. I answer, Some do and some do not. Fish, oysters, lobsters, and all marine shell fish are as much *animals* as a horse or an elephant; but does the Examiner pretend that these all *breathe?* How does an oyster breathe, and where are his "nostrils?" Your error consists in supposing that there are no animals but *land* animals,—birds, quadrupeds, &c.—forgetting the fact that the earth and waters are full of animals that have *life*, but have no "NOSTRILS," and do not

"BREATHE." Many such, like the whole tribe of shell-fish, live without breathing, and have no red blood. It is certain, therefore, that there may be life without nostrils or breathing; and your favorite hypothesis that *breath* in the nostrils is the only cause of life, falls to the ground.

6. You have finally admitted, virtually, that upon your theory all that was necessary to cause the lifeless body of Adam to live was to fill his lungs with air, and set him to breathing. This you do by citing a case in which a "lifeless" body was brought to life by the application of heat, and stimulants, and air breathed into the lungs. But was there no more life here than in Adam before God breathed into his nostrils? Was ever a person thus brought to life who was really DEAD? You think there have been; and that if there had only been some one to have used the bellows, or blown the breath into Adam's nostrils, instead of his Maker, he would just as surely have become a living soul! This is the obvious import of your remarks; and it is all that is demanded by my "bellows argument," which you have tried in vain to laugh out of countenance.

7. You kindly inform our readers once more that my arguments are irrelevant, or rather, now, that I have altogether "abandoned the ground I was pledged to defend." Still you condescend to follow me out of courtesy. Well, if I waste my time arguing other questions, that is my loss. But I have no difficulty in seeing the connexion between my arguments and the proposition; and I think our readers will not. Why not let *them* judge, and not attempt to act as disputant and umpire both?

8. I must remind you that we are not discussing the question of the HAPPINESS or MISERY of souls after they leave the body. It is enough, for my present purpose, that I prove that they *separate* from the body at death. Excuse me, therefore, if I decline following you at present, in your disquisitions upon future punishment.

I trust, however, that our readers will not be so blinded by this "dust" as not to see the utter weakness of your reply to my proofs and arguments.

Leaving for the present the balance of your ten pages of response (solely for want of space in your columns to answer all you have said,) I shall now proceed with my argument.

To show that man has a *soul* distinct from his body, and originally "superadded thereto," I have already established the following points:

I. That the Scriptures everywhere recognize the philosophical distinction between the BODY *and the* SPIRIT; *and the two-fold nature of man.*

II. That they uniformly represent death as a SEPARATION *of the body and spirit of man.*

You have been pleased to pronounce both of these propositions irrelevant to the question, and will probably honor my next with a similar judgment; and yet I doubt if we have a solitary reader who will not admit that if either of these propositions is proved, the doctrine that man has a soul superadded to his material nature is established. And yet you pronounce the arguing of these propositions the "abandoning the question at issue entirely!" You can see no connection, between the *separation* of the soul from the body at death, and the question whether man has a soul or not! I may prove from the Bible that the body and spirit are DISTINCT—that the soul LEAVES the body at death—and that it is CONSCIOUS from death to the general resurrection;—but all this does not even prove that man has a soul distinct from his body!!

Leaving our readers to judge between us, I shall now proceed to show,

III. That man has not only a SOUL *distinct from his body, which* SEPARATES *from it at death; but that the period between death and the general resurrection is one of* CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE *to all human spirits.*

1. The first proof that I shall offer in support of this proposition is the words of Christ to the dying thief, Luke 23: 42, 43. "And he [the thief] said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily, I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

It is obvious, first, that the thief expected to die. Hence he speaks of their being "in like condition" with Christ, "receiving the due reward of their deeds." And you certainly will not deny that the prevailing belief among the Jews was, that the soul left the body at death, and went to Hades, or the world of spirits, to return again at the general resurrection. Hence Josephus, in his discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades, says, "This is the discourse concerning Hades, wherein the souls of all men are confined until a proper season which God hath determined, when he will make a resurrection of all men from the dead. * * * And to every body shall its own soul be restored."

This was the popular belief among the Jews at the time of the crucifixion, and was evidently the belief of the thief when he made his request, "Lord, remember me, &c.

The term "Paradise" signifies *pleasure* or *delight;* and is used in the New Testament to signify *Heaven.* Paul was caught up to Paradise, 2 Cor. 12: 4; and when the spirit would incite believers to holiness by the promise of eternal life, he says, "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God;" Rev. 2: 7. Now the promise of the Saviour was that the thief should be with him THAT DAY in paradise? Is not paradise the heaven to which Paul was caught up, where grows the tree of life? If not, what is it? In what other paradise did Christ and the thief meet that day? Here, then, we have the explicit declaration of Christ that according to the prevailing belief of the separate existence of souls, implied in his request, the thief should meet him THAT DAY in heaven. If he meant simply that he would be DEAD that day—in the paradise of unconsciousness—what kind of a "remembrance" was that? and what better off was he who prayed, than he who railed? The passage can have but one meaning; and that is that the spirit of the thief should meet the spirit of Christ, which he was about to commend to his Father's hands, in the kingdom of heaven.

2. Luke 20 : 27, 38. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not the God of the dead but of the living : for ALL LIVE UNTO HIM."

The Lord appeared to Moses in the bush 1491 years before Christ. Abraham died B. C. 1821, Isaac, B. C. 1716, and Jacob, B. C. 1689 ; consequently at that time, (1491, B. C.) Abraham had been dead 330 years, Isaac 225 years, and Jacob 198 years. And yet God declares himself to be the God of those persons. Now the argument of our Lord, based upon this passage is this : God is not the God of the dead, but of the living only ; God is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob ; therefore Abraham, Isaac and Jacob must still live.

And this he distinctly declares ; "all live unto God." The bearing of this quotation upon the resurrection of the dead is this : The Sadducees denied the immortality of the soul, as well as the resurrection of the body. And with them the two doctrines stood or fell together. To show, therefore, that the soul lived after death, and thus to overthrow the *system* of the Sadducees, was to silence their objections to the resurrection. Besides, if the soul of Abraham survived the death of his body, it affords ground for a strong presumption that sooner or later the body will live also.

3. Matt. 10 : 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but ARE NOT ABLE TO KILL THE SOUL :" Here we have, (1,) the distinction between the soul and body. The soul is not the body, neither is the body the soul. (2,) While men are able to kill the body, they "are not able to kill the soul." The soul is not killed, then, when the body is killed. And yet you insist that the soul dies in all cases with the body ; so that whenever the body of a disciple was killed by the persecutor, his soul was killed also. To this I oppose the express declaration of Christ, that men "are NOT ABLE TO KILL THE SOUL." It LIVES after the body dies, for "ALL LIVE UNTO GOD."

4. The conscious existence of the spirit after death is clearly taught in the account of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke 16 : 19–31. And it makes no difference whether it be regarded as a history or a parable. In both cases the souls of the parties are represented as living, talking, remembering, &c., after death. The rich man dies, and is buried, and then lifts up his eyes in hell, living in torments. Lazarus "dies," and is carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom. What does this misery after death—this reference to the "life-time" of Dives as then past—indeed this whole narrative teach, if it be not this ;—that souls live after the body dies, and are happy or miserable in a future state ?

Let any reader turn to this narrative, and read it carefully over, verse after verse, (for I have not room to quote it) and if he does not find there the doctrine of the conscious existence of souls after death, he can find it in no creed or essay or argument. Language could not teach it more plainly ; and the spirit that can pervert this, would pervert any language that could be used.

5. Matt. 17 : 3. "And there appeared unto him Moses and Elias talking unto him." Elias or Elijah was translated to heaven 928 years before, without seeing death. See 2 Kings, 2d chapter. Moses DIED 1483 years before. "So Moses, the servant of the Lord, died there in the land of Moab —and he, [Jehovah] buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Beth-peor : but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." Deut. 34. 5.

This passage settles the fact that Moses DIED and WAS BURIED.

But neither the body of Moses, nor that of any other person, had at that time risen from the dead, "to die no more." Christ was to be "the first that should rise from the dead," Acts 26 : 23 ; and St. Paul declares that he was the "first fruits of them that slept." 1 Cor. 15 : 20. He styles him "the first born from the dead ; that in all things he might have the preeminence," Col. 1 : 18 ; and the Revelator also calls him "the first begotten of the dead," Rev. 1 : 5.

Nothing, therefore, can be clearer than this ; that as the transfiguration was before the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, the body of Moses had not been raised from the dead. What was it, then, that appeared on Mount Tabor, and talked with Christ ? that which Matthew calls "Moses ?" His *body* certainly was not there, for he had not risen from the dead ; and as you say human souls have no life or consciousness till their bodies are raised ; will you please tell us what this "Moses" was ?

I offer this as an incontrovertible instance, in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body it once occupied lay in the grave. The *spirit* of Moses met Elijah and Christ on the top of Talor near fifteen centuries after his body died, and while it yet slumbered in the valley of Moab, where it doubtless sleeps still ; and yet you affirm that spirits have no conscious existence out of the body ! Please be particular and give this case your special attention in the next response.

6. The book of Revelation represents the righteous dead as indescribably happy, singing and praising God in a world of light. In the 7th chapter a great multitude which no man could number is seen before the throne, clothed in whitfe and with palms in their hands. They came out of grea ttribulation, but are now before the throne, where all tears are wiped away.

> "No oppressive heat they feel,
> From the sun's director ray ;
> In a milder clime they dwell,
> Region of eternal day."

In the 5th chapter we have another view of the happy residents of heaven and also in the 19th chapter it is written, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord FROM HENCEFORTH." They have not to sleep a thousand, or four thousand years, before they can be with Christ, as Materialism teaches, but will enter *at once* upon their reward.

"We know when the silver chord is loosed,
When the veil is rent away,
Not long and dark shall the passage be,
To the realms of endless day."

Now all these apocalyptic views of the heavenly world are essentially wrong, unless it be true that the spirits of the righteous dead are now happy with Christ in heaven, while their bodies slumber in the grave till the resurrection morn. Let it not be forgotten that they are beyond the region of tears and sorrow: and therefore the description can relate to no assembly of mortals on this side of death. They are our happy brethren who, like Moses, have crossed the flood and entered Canaan, though their bodies still sleep in the vale of death.

7. In harmony with this last representation, the spirits of the dead are to return to earth with Christ when he shall come to raise their bodies and judge the world. Paul speaks of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ WITH ALL HIS SAINTS; 1 Thess. 3 : 13; and Jude, quoting the prophecy of Enoch says, "Behold the Lord cometh WITH TEN THOUSAND OF HIS SAINTS," &c., v. 14.

Now, we ask, *Who* and *what* are these "saints" that are to come with Christ at his second appearing? Are they the *bodies* of Christians that he is coming to raise? or are they the *spirits* of the sainted dead, who have been with him for ages in heaven, and now accompany him back as he descends to blow the last dread trumpet, and to raise their bodies to glory and immortality? Is not this last the obvious and incontrovertible doctrine of Divine Revelation?

I have thus shown from the Scriptures that the creature Man, has a distinct superadded entity called the soul,

First. By the history of the creation of Adam, in which the body is first made, and then the spirit breathed into it:

Secondly, By a large class of Scriptures recognizing the distinction between the body and the spirit, and the two-fold nature of man:

Thirdly, By numerous Scriptures which represent death as a SEPARATION of the soul from the body, and

Finally, By numerous passages that teach that the soul is CONSCIOUS *in* HAPPINESS OR MISERY, *from death to the general resurrection.*

Life begins with the *union* of soul and body—death is a *separation* of these two natures—the souls of the righteous ascend to "paradise," or "Abraham's bosom," at death, to be with Christ till he return to raise their bodies, now made incorruptible and glorious, and in them ascend to heaven to dwell in God's presence forever! Such is the plain, simple, obvious, but *glorious* teaching of divine revelation.

I have not introduced arguments drawn from philosophy or metaphysics, because the question was, *What do the Scriptures teach?* and I have by no means exhausted the Scripture argument. Yet I shall devote no further space to the direct proofs of the single question, whether or not man has a soul. If the arguments adduced, do not prove it, nothing could. In my next, therefore, I shall pay my respects more directly to my Reviewer of the Examiner.

H. MATTISON.

NEW YORK, Sept. 2d.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER 1, 1854.

Response to Prof. Mattison by the Editor.

We shall, as heretofore, follow the Prof. by his numbered paragraphs, or topics; noticing first his remarks on our last response.

"1." We made no "virtual concession" such as the Prof. speaks of; and hence are not "disposed to take back" anything. We are glad that the Prof. sees that the spiritual body, of which Paul speaks, 1 Cor. 15, is an organized body, and not an immaterial one. His assumption that it is such an one as angels do not have, rests on his mere *ipse-dixit*, and the Prof.'s "indubitably settled" point, "that spirits can and do exist without material bodies," rests alone on his assumption, and is unsupported by a solitary testimony of Scripture: and hence is not "fatal" to our materialism, nor in the least degree convincing.

"2." We did not say that the Prof. argued the existence of a soul in man from the "*simple* fact that he manifests intelligence;" but he did make that fact *one* of his arguments; and we affirmed, and now *re*-affirm, that such an argument equally proves a soul in all animals which manifest intelligence. We do not know what the Prof. means, by asking if we had not better have quoted his argument on the point. It was before the reader in his own article and in his own words. Surely that was enough.

"3." The Prof. here felt himself in a "strait betwixt two"—*viz:* The authority of the Scriptures and that of Mr. Webster; but finally chose to rely on the latter; and thus makes out to his own satisfaction that he is justified in using the terms soul and spirit synonymously, or as words of the same import. We would inform him, however, that Mr. Webster is just as good authority, in this case, as the Prof. himself, and no better. The Prof. and his theological school have assumed that these terms are synonymous, and that soul and spirit mean the same thing, viz., an immortal entity in man; and Mr. Webster, as a faithful Lexicographer, tells the world one sense attached to these words, by *theological* usage, is, an "immaterial and immortal part in man," &c. Does that prove the *theological* definition is true? By no means. What saith "the law and testimony? if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." We have, in our previous articles, shown that the scripture usage is against the *theological* use of the terms soul and spirit; and that they are not synonymous in scripture, nor used interchangeably. Till

the Prof. can show they are, he only deals in assumptions, and Mr. Webster cannot help him. We think if the Prof. could have obtained help from the Bible he would no more have gone to Webster than to the witch of Endor. We told him in our last what Rachel's was, and shall not repeat it. See Examiner, page 266. One thing is perfectly certain, it was not a *theological* spirit; and all the Prof.'s "proof texts"—as he calls them—based on the term spirit, have no stronger foundation than Mr. Webster's *echo* of theological assumptions. But Mr. Webster gives 21 definitions of the term spirit, and his first is—"*Primarily*, wind; air in motion: hence, *breath*." On the term soul he has 15 definitions; and gives no scripture authority for the one for which the Prof. contends.

"4." The Prof.'s kind attempt to help us out of the confusion arising from his language on 1 Cor. 15: 46, in his last, is appreciated by us; yet we have to confess, we get no light from the effort. The very first thing the Prof. introduces from Paul's words is fatal to his interpretation. It is—"How are *the dead* raised up? and with what *bodies* do they [*the dead*] come?" It is not—How do souls come down from heaven, and what bodies do they get? So it should read to correspond with the Prof.'s theory. But it is *the dead* that are to be raised, and come with some *bodies*. "With what bodies do *they* come?" Is it that body they had at death? No, saith Paul—"That which thou sowest is not that body which shall be," &c., "but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body." *The dead* are the subjects of the resurrection, and these dead are to come with bodies; thus showing that the apostle is not speaking of the body merely, nor mainly; but of *the man*, whom he affirms to be dead; and whose case he had declared to be hopeless for a future life if there is no resurrection.

The construction which the Prof. puts on the 44th verse, and onward, is totally inadmissible on his own theory. He saith, the first man Adam is the BODY; or that he "had only the natural body without the soul, and, afterward the spirit which gave it life." The text he quotes to prove this is, "The first man Adam was made a LIVING SOUL." Let it be well observed, that our Prof. affirms the first man Adam, "had ONLY the natural body WITHOUT THE SOUL;" and that it was the spirit, i. e., the soul, according to his theology, or the second man that gave life to the first man. But Paul, in opposition to the Prof. affirms "the first man Adam was made a living soul;" and that it was *afterward* that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. "Howbeit that was not first which was spiritual, but that which is natural"—*psuchikon—animal*. It was the animal man that was the living soul, and not a superadded second Adam called soul. The living soul was such, Paul affirms, *before* the spiritual body was brought into existence; indeed, so far as man is concerned, he teaches the spiritual is yet future, and only to be realized at the last trump; and that all men, so far as descended only from Adam the first, are of the earth earthy.

That the Apostle speaks of two Adams in this chapter, in our mind, does not admit of a doubt. That those two were Adam the first, or earthy Adam, and the last Adam, which was heavenly, and was Christ, is unquestionable. He introduced Christ at the opening of the chapter: Christ died—Christ was buried—Christ rose from the dead—Christ became the first-fruits of them that slept—by MAN came death; by MAN came also the resurrection from the dead: IN ADAM men die, IN CHRIST men are made alive. Christ the first-fruits, *afterward* they that are Christ's at his coming. There is a natural—*psuchikon—animal* body, or *person*—for the term body is often used in Scripture for the person himself—and there is a spiritual body or person. Here is a clear carrying out his argument in the first part of the chapter, by showing what the animal Adam did, namely, brought death to his race; and what may be expected from Christ, whom he now speaks of as the last Adam, who is to give life from the dead to all *in* Christ. "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul" or creature: "the last Adam a quickening spirit." From this statement the Prof. says, "First the body, then the spirit;" and adds, "We should like to know where else"—than in Gen. 2: 7—"anything like it is written"? and affirms, "no where in all the Bible."

Now, what does Paul say is written? First—"The first man Adam was made a LIVING SOUL"—not a mere body without life, as the Prof.'s theory maintains, dependent upon another Adam, afterward, to be superadded to give him life. We now ask, Does the apostle say, "it is WRITTEN, the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit?" His language does not necessarily imply such a construction, but we are quite willing the Prof. should have it so; and he saith it is no where else written in all the Bible, that the last Adam was made a quickening spirit, except in Gen. 2: 7!

Sure, we are, it is not written there, wherever else it may or may not be found. But when Adam the first had brought death upon himself and posterity "it is written," that THE SEED of the woman "shall bruise" the "head" of the tempter; which shows who the "QUICKENING spirit" was to be—not Adam the first, nor an immaterial spirit in him, but a seed to be born of woman; a second Adam, of whom Paul saith, Rom. 5. 14, the Adam before Moses, was a FIGURE. This promised seed was AFTERWARD more fully exhibited to Abraham as his seed, which Paul saith, Gal. 3: 16, "WAS CHRIST." That seed was "written" of by nearly all the prophets of the Old Testament, and "written" of as a "quickening spirit," to give life to those who inherit death by their descent from Adam the first. So fully was he WRITTEN of that Jesus tells the Jews their Scriptures reveal eternal life, testifying of him as the person to whom they should come if they would have life. See John 5: 39, 40. And in the same chapter IT IS WRITTEN: "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them; even so the Son QUICKENETH whom he will." Thus notwithstanding the Prof.'s hasty affirmation, we find it written throughout the Bible, in various forms, and in the text last quoted, in express terms, that Christ quickeneth; and is hence the spiritual Adam—the promised seed to quicken and give life to men, such as they had not by the first Adam; and so Paul saith, Rom. 8: 8–11, "If any man have not the SPIRIT of Christ, he is none of his, * * * and if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you"—thus being made partakers of the spiritual nature of Christ—"he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also QUICKEN your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you:" not by an immaterial soul, superadded to your bodies at your creation! Christ—the last Adam—by God's appointment has become the head of the spiritual creation; he has the quickening power, to quicken men from the dead, and cause them to live again.

We have now shown that the Prof.'s statement—that "the last Adam was made a quickening spirit," was no where WRITTEN in all the Bible, except Gen. 2: 7,—is a pure *assumption*. His concluding remarks on this topic, gives the Universalists the entire ground, and contradicts the Apostle's testimony; for the Apostle clearly distinguishes between those "in Christ" and those not. "If in this life only WE have hope in Christ, WE are of ALL MEN most miserable;" verse 19. Here is a clear distinction between believers and unbelievers; and Paul in winding up his argument, saith, "WE," [who? men, "without faith," as the Prof. affirms? No: "we," in distinction of all other men with whom he had contrasted those in Christ.] "We shall not all sleep, but WE" [who are IN Christ] "shall all be changed," &c. Whatever the Scriptures may say of the resurrection of the wicked elsewhere, the apostle is not talking of them here. He is showing how those who sleep in Jesus, or being in Christ and are alive at the last trump, are to be made incorruptible and immortal, through and by Christ; and adds, "Thanks be to God which giveth US the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." Those who are the subjects of the resurrection and change, Paul speaks of here, triumph and praise God for their deliverance from death and corruption; and Paul tells us who shall have this glorious privilege—"To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, SEEK FOR glory, and honor, and IMMORTALITY, eternal life:" Rom. 2: 7. Such a course requires faith; and we rather think no man will get incorruptibility or immortality without faith, the Prof. to the contrary notwithstanding.

"5." If the Prof. finds animals that do not breathe, our remarks had no reference to them. We spoke of that class that do breathe, and gave Scripture testimony on the subject, which the Prof. did not choose to controvert. Let him try his skill at disproving that the animals we named live without breath, or without nostrils. Till he can do that his talk about oysters and shell-fish avails nothing. We spoke of such creatures as live by breathing. Will our friend tell us if such creatures as were made to live by breathing can live without breath in their nostrils? When their breath goeth forth do they not die? We will give him one more text on this subject which may cover the whole ground so far as our discussion is concerned. Psa. 104: 25 to 30. "This great and wide SEA, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts * * * there is that leviathan, whom thou hast made to play therein; these all wait upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season * * * thou openest thy hand, they are filled with good; * * * thou takest away THEIR BREATH, they die and return to their dust." Now, so far as relates to other animals, besides "land animals," even the "innumerable CREEPING THINGS in the sea," inspiration testifies they live by "breath," and that when God "takest away their breath, they die:" but the Prof.'s "philosophy" affirms revelation is in "error:" for saith he, "The earth and waters are full of animals that have life but do not breathe!" That is, they have NO BREATH for God to take away!

"6." The Prof., under this head, "virtually" denies that the child was dead that Elisha restored to life. The record saith, the child "died:" 2 Kings, 4: 20.

"7." We are perfectly willing to let "our readers judge" in this matter, and have no fears what their judgment will be.

"8." The Prof. has not proved yet that such a soul exists in man, as he contends for: not one solitary text has he produced up to this point of the discussion to favor his affirmative. No evidence has he given that soul and spirit are synonymous terms in Scripture usage, and yet he insists that if he can prove spirit and body are separated at death there must have been superadded to the creature man an entity called the soul, at his creation. BREATH is separated from the body at death. "His BREATH GOETH, he returneth to his dust," &c. "There was NO BREATH left in him" at death. See Psa. 146: 4, and 1 Kings 17: 17. Now the Prof. might just as well attempt to prove from such expressions that the breath is a distinct entity—a conscious being—as to attempt to prove a distinct entity in man called the soul, from the fact that that which is called spirit in man is se-

parated from the body at death. The truth is, the Scriptures never speak of either the soul or spirit as a distinct entity from man, any more than they do of his breath, his heart, or any other attribute of man.

The Prof. suggested at the outset that he should pass most of our last response unnoticed at present, assigning as one reason that we had intimated that he was devoting too much time to his Reviewer and too little to the direct argument. Now, we intended no such intimation: we meant to give him the largest liberty consistent with keeping to the question at issue. Notwithstanding his intention to pass most we said, he has devoted five-twelfths of his present article to his Reviewer's response. We have no fault to find with him for having done so, tho' we are glad to have him go on with the direct argument. We shall now follow him in it. To his

"I." We reply—The Scriptures no "where recognize" the *theological* "distinction between the body and spirit" of man: nor the theological idea of "the two-fold nature of man." Man is *one*, not two, however many things might enter into his constitution. As *one*, or as a unit, the Scriptures treat him, speak to him, command him, threaten him, and promise him. Or in other words, they uniformly regard him as *a whole*, and not as two separate entities. They regard him as capable of dissolution, and when dissolved as dead; not one entity alive and another dead; and hence teach us the importance of a resurrection from the dead in order to being alive again; whereas the theological distinction, for which the Prof. contends, teaches that the essential man is a distinct entity called the soul, and lives in spite of death, and must live whether there be a resurrection or not. In fact, there is not, and cannot be a resurrection of *the man*, because *the man, viz.*: the soul entity, was never dead; and hence Christ is not the resurrection and the life to man, but only of the soul's cage, called the body. A mighty honor that!

"II." The Prof. says the Scriptures "uniformly represent death as a separation of the body and spirit of man." Yes, and they as uniformly represent death as a separation of the *breath* and body; and such a representation just as truly proves the breath an entity as the spirit of man. The question is not settled and cannot be settled by such argumentation: it is naught but pure assumption; and ten thousand such theological assumptions are lighter than vanity in an untrammeled mind. The question comes back, Is that spirit, separated from the body in death, a distinct entity, or being, called the soul? The Prof. affirms it is, and we deny it; and he, as yet, in our judgment, has utterly failed to sustain his affirmative. As to the "consciousness of soul or spirit," when the man is dead, the Prof. has not one solitary text in the Bible that affirms that doctrine. His argument on this point is all *inferential:* he infers it, as all others on his side of the question do, while disregarding the *positive* declarations of inspiration that "there is no knowledge in sheol"—the state of the dead; "the dead know not anything;" Eccl. 9: 5, 10: "there is no remembrance of God in death; in sheol" (the state of death) "who shall give thee thanks?" a most expressive question, importing that it cannot be done. Psa. 6: 5. If any doubt remained as to the fact, the Psalmist removes it by saying, "The dead praise not the Lord," Psa. 115: 17; and Hezekiah declares that "Sheol cannot praise God;" Isa. 38: 18. Those who are there—and all the dead are in sheol—cannot praise God; and Solomon has told us why they cannot do it, viz: because there is no knowledge there: Eccl. 9: 10. With inspired testimony of this positive character against the consciousness of the dead, what avails all the theological inferences to the contrary? Just nothing at all; yet we shall examine the Prof.'s texts from which he expects to prove "virtually," that David, Solomon, and Hezekiah were all wrong, and that "a soul" separated from the body at death has "a conscious existence between death and the general resurrection." This point he takes up under head "III;" and commences with the "thief," Luke 23: 42, 43.

It is not of the least weight in argument what the Jews believed in the time of the thief: and our Prof. would have shown himself more of a theologian if he had appealed to the Hebrew Scriptures instead of calling on Josephus for help. At the same period here spoken of the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls; and the Prof. might as well have appealed to that fact to prove that Socrates was right in supposing some men's souls would go into bears, asses, ants, &c., after their separation from their bodies by death. We have shown the Hebrew Scriptures condemn the idea of consciousness or knowledge when men are dead. Unless Jesus taught the contrary by positive declarations we have no right to affirm a doctrine is true, because Josephus and the Jews believed it in his days. Jesus did teach, and teach distinctly, that the "resurrection, *at the last day*" is the hope for a future life. What he said to the thief, therefore, is to be understood in harmony with all his other declarations. He never promised his followers a reward till "the resurrection of the just;" Luke 14: 14; and that resurrection he told them would be "at the last day," John 6: 40: when the Son of Man shall come in his glory;" Matt. 16: 27. And "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, THEN shall he sit upon THE THRONE of his glory:" then will be the time of "his appearing and KINGDOM." The thief prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." "*Into*," says Bishop Whately, "is a mis-translation; it should be '*in* thy kingdom:' the meaning is—at thy second coming in triumphant glory."—Future States, p. 324. Jesus' answer is in harmony with the prayer—"Verily I say unto thee to-day," or *this* day—what day? the day they hung upon the cross? *No:* but the day the thief had just spoken of, *viz:* when Christ shall come in his kingdom; or, if it suits better—shall come *into* his kingdom. The answer is, in the day of Christ's coming into, or in his kingdom, the thief should be with him in paradise: in that delightful state.

The assumption that paradise is the *theological* heaven, is an unfounded speculation, without one text in the book of God to sustain it. Paul's

"third heaven" *is* the same as paradise; but we may yet show that the third heaven of Paul has not the relationship of a "third" cousin to the *theological* heaven of the Prof. The fact is, the thief did not die the same day that Jesus did: for the Jewish day ended at evening, or sun down. Jesus died about 3 o'clock, P. M., but when the evening was come, the thieves were still alive and had their legs broken to hasten their death; for death by crucifixion was a lingering one. Here then is a *fact* which shows Jesus did not speak of *the day in which* the thief prayed. But again. Three days after the promise of Christ to the thief, Jesus declares to Mary, John 20: 17, "I am not yet ascended to my Father." Yet the Prof. affirms, Jesus did go to heaven the very day he died! Which shall we believe; him who is "the way, *the truth*, and the life," or the Prof.? Jesus did not ascend to paradise—"to heaven"—for three days, certain: so if the thief went there prior to that time, he did not find Jesus, and the promise, as construed by the Prof., *failed!* Any attempt to evade the words of our Lord, John 20: 17, by saying, He meant he had not been to heaven in his body, or his body had not been there, is "puerile" indeed. Jesus speaks of *himself*—his *personality*—"*I* am not *yet* ascended," &c. Jesus—*the person*—had not been to paradise the third day after the crucifixion; thus "we have the explicit declaration of Christ" that the Prof.'s construction of the text under consideration is not correct; and that the *Pharisaic* notion of separated souls going to heaven is a falsehood. The "passage can have but one meaning," and that is adverse to our Prof. And it is further fatal to him, from the fact that Jesus saith not one word about his own spirit or soul, nor that of the thief. "*Thou* shalt be with *me*:" not, your spirit shall meet my spirit, as the Prof. affirms. Hark! "Thou shalt be with *me*." Three days after, the same *me* saith, "*I* am not yet ascended." Here is a "strait betwixt *two*" for our Prof. If here is not demonstration of the utter incorrectness of the theological assumptions from this text then let the Prof. show it.

"2." The Prof.'s appeal to our Lord's discourse with the Sadducees, is powerless; and when interpreted in the light of the facts in the case, and the positive scripture testimony that the dead are without knowledge, it totally subverts his theory. What are the facts? "The Sadducees deny that there is any resurrection;" verse 27; and they used the term *death* in the sense of eternal cessation of being. To disprove the doctrine of a restoration to life by a resurrection, they present the case of a woman who had seven husbands, and then inquire —"*In the resurrection* whose wife of them is she?" v. 33. Jesus informs them that in "the resurrection from *the dead*" they "neither marry nor are given in mariage;" v. 35. He then proceeds to say—"Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he called the Lord the God of Abraham," &c., v. 37; or, as Matthew records it, chap. 22: 31, "As *touching* the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham," &c.? "For he is not the God of the dead"—*i. e.*, of those who have eternally ceased from life or being; which was the state of all the dead according to the Sadducees—"but the God of the living"—those who are to live again by a resurrection; for, saith Jesus, It is "touching the resurrection of the dead" that God spake to Moses in the bush—therefore, the conclusion is inevitable, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have a resurrection from the dead, for God is their God, which he could not be if there is no resurrection: hence Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "all live unto Him"—in His counsel and purpose, which makes their future life sure by a resurrection: "God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were," as he had previously said to Abraham, "I have made thee a father of many nations;" and this when as yet he had no child. See Rom. 4: 17.

According to the Prof.'s theology, God is not the God of the *bodies* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, because by his own admission, their bodies were *dead;* and "the Lord is not the God of *the dead;*" therefore, He is not the God of those patriarchs bodies! Hence their bodies will never have a resurrection, if the Prof.'s theology be correct; and as he affirms their souls were not dead, a resurrection of them is impossible, because it is *the dead* that are to *be raised*. Thus Sadduceeism is triumphant, instead of being silenced.

The Prof.'s theological theory, and that of his school, is, That our Lord proved the resurrection of the dead by proving that dead men are *now alive!* Would such an argument have silenced the Sadducees? Never; nor any other thinking man that thinks beyond a theological *creed*. How does the fact that the persons are alive prove a future resurrection of dead men? Let it not be forgotten *the resurrection* is the question at issue, and not the living existence of a soul entity. Jesus, we may depend, did not wander from the question: therefore he spoke of the *purpose* of God to raise *the dead* patriarchs, and demonstrated it by an appeal to the law and testimony; for if there is no resurrection of them, then have they *eternally* ceased from life: but their death is not such a cessation from life, for the Lord calls himself their God, which he would not do if he had not purposed they should live again by a resurrection from the dead. Let the Prof., and all others, remember, that there is not one word in that entire controversy with the Sadducees about a soul or spirit, the important *fixtures* in Prof. M.'s vocabulary! Strange, indeed, if Jesus intended to teach the soul-entity doctrine of the Prof., that he entirely omits to speak of it, at all, and lays all the stress on the resurrection of the dead. Look at it. The Prof. has to talk about Abraham's "soul and body;" but Jesus saith not a word of either, but talks of "the dead" and of their *resurrection*, and the proof of it from the fact that without it God is not their God; because without it they did not and could not live; but to God, and in His purpose, they do live, because their resurrection is certain as the unchangeable purposes of His counsel.

We sum up on this head thus: The Sadducees denied the resurrection from the dead—the great doctrine Jesus taught. Jesus proved the resurrection was certain, or Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob

could not be said to have Jehovah for their God, inasmuch as he is not the God of those dead in the Sadducee sense. This proof from Moses *silenced* them; not by teaching their "souls" were alive, but by demonstrating the resurrection from the dead, without which they could not be alive. But on the Prof.'s views, the Sadducees could not have been silenced, for they might have replied—"Master, how does the fact that these patriarchs are now alive prove the resurrection from the dead?" Surely, it could have been no proof at all; and the Prof. himself can make no more of it than "a strong *presumption* that sooner or later the *body* will live also?" No, Prof., it does not give even a presumption that way, but the reverse: and theologians of the Prof.'s school are fast losing sight of the importance of the resurrection; and his Br. Dr. Adam Clarke, could not tell why the doctrine of the resurrection is so little dwelt upon, and its importance so little felt, in these days, when it was so prominent and so much insisted on by the apostles. We can tell him. It is because an immortal soul is substituted for, and takes the place of the resurrection, in these days: and according to the Prof.'s theology a resurrection is a useless incumbrance to the once caged but now free soul. Has the uncaged soul of Abel been six thousand years basking in heaven, and must it now be sent after its cage that Cain broke to pieces? How useless! How revolting to that long happy soul! The resurrection of the body, on the common theory, has no importance, and is a positive evil; and hence many thinking men, who believe in the immortal soul-entity, are abandoning the resurrection altogether, or making it an emergence of their fancy-souls out of the body at death; and so death is the deliverer, and its praises are sung, while Jesus and the Bible resurrection are completely supplanted by this theological soul-entity.

"3." We admit that so far as *words* are concerned, Matt. 10: 28, looks most like sustaining the Prof. of anything he has urged; yet we "fear not." If a theory is to be established by a disregard for many positive texts, opposing the construction put upon this text,—and by an appeal to popular prejudice, then is the Prof. successful; and any Papist is equally successful when he quotes the "express declaration of Christ," "*This is my body*," to prove the eucharistical bread "is the *real body* of Christ."

Whatever the text means it does not mean that men cannot kill the soul in any sense: because the Scripture testimony, five times repeated in one chapter, viz., Joshua 10th, is, that men have killed and "*utterly destroyed souls*:" see verses 28, 30, 32, 35, 39. The Prof.'s construction, therefore, of Matt. 10: 28, cannot be the true one. Besides, whatever the soul is, that is here spoken of, it is something that God can and will *destroy* if the person is wicked. We may arrive at the true sense of the text by comparing it with our Lord's words, Matt. 16: 25, and parallel texts. The same original word is found in Matt. 10: 28, and 16: 25. The latter text reads thus—"Whosoever will save his *life* [*psuchen—soul*] shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his *life* (*psuchen—soul*) for my sake shall find it." The following verse has the same original word, and is translated *soul*. On this 26th verse, Dr. Adam Clarke says—"On what authority many have translated the *psuchen*, in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this verse, *soul*, I know not: but am certain it means *life* in both places." Now, a man may be deprived of *present life* by man, but man cannot extinguish *life* so as to make it a *final destruction*, but God can. Men may kill us now, "but after that have no more that they can do;" Luke 12: 4; but God "can destroy both *life and body*:" utterly extinguish them.

Let it be remembered our Lord was, in each of the cases we have introduced, talking to his disciples *alone*, and fortifying them against temptations to apostacy under their persecutions. He tells them men can only deprive them of animal or bodily life, while God holds in his hands another and more important life, which they "shall find" if faithful unto death—a life of which men cannot deprive them, though God is able to remove them *utterly* from all life, and will do it if they sin by apostacy: therefore, "fear Him," and not men who have no such power. Such an interpretation is in harmony with all our Lord's teaching; and in harmony with the positive testimony of the Bible that the dead have "no knowledge," and that the resurrection of the dead is the only hope of man.

"4." As the Prof. seems to admit the case of the Rich Man and Lazarus is a parable, we are saved any labor on that score. But if it was intended to teach that there is a "superadded entity, called the soul," in the "creature man which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground," it is sadly defective in the Prof.'s important *fixtures*: for there is no mention of either soul or spirit in the entire parable, nor of *body* as distinguished from the men themselves. If these men had such souls as the Prof. contends for, it is passing strange that not one word is uttered about them; while the Prof. affirms "the *souls* of the parties are represented as living, talking," &c., therefore "*souls* live after death," and the text teaches "the conscious existence of *souls* after death;" and yet, we repeat it, not one word is said about soul or spirit in the whole account. Are your "creeds" as deficient in these *fixtures*, Prof.? We can find them often, in nearly all the creeds in Christendom.

If this portion of Scripture is a parable, as nearly all commentators are agreed, then it is not a history of individual persons, but an allegory to represent some events in the future. Bishop Lowth says—"Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of *fictitious* or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

The truth to be illustrated by this parable is, that two classes of men were to be very differently affected by the change in the dispensation from the law of Moses to that of the Gospel; and this key to it is given us at verse 16—"The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached," &c. Here is the change now taking place; the effect on two classes of men, *viz*: Jews and Gentiles, is the point to be illustrated by the parable. The peculiarities of the Jewish economy were to pass away

—their peculiar relation to God, which was their life-time, was to end, and a more spiritual dispensation was to be opened: the Gentiles were hereafter to enjoy privileges, and a relation to God and His covenant with Abraham, which had not before been possessed. The change in the condition of Jews and believing Gentiles is fitly represented by death. The Jews lost their peculiar privileges, and, rejecting Messiah, have been politically and ecclesiastically dead ever since, and in a state of torment such as no other people ever experienced for near 1800 years; while the believing Gentiles passing from that state in which they were "not a people" became interested in the Abrahamic covenant, and are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. See Gal. 3: 9, 29.

In a parable we are to look only for the main scope and design of it; and not like some mere theorists and speculators attempt to find something to correspond with every minutiæ that is introduced into it. This parable we regard in the light, then, of a simple and forcible representation of the different states of those under the law covenant, and those who were turned to the covenant of grace, or favor, made through Abraham in Jesus Christ, and fully opened at the advent of Jesus some 1800 years ago, and which is still in force, so that they who are Christ's are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise," and "are blessed with faithful Abraham;" having promise of life eternal when Christ shall return "*from* heaven" to raise all his saints from the dead "at the last day."

"5." The case of Moses at the transfiguration is next presented as proof by our Prof. Now, as the Prof.'s school maintain spirits are immaterial, they cannot be seen by material eyes; therefore it was not Moses' spirit, nor his disembodied soul, that was present; for the disciples *saw* "two men, who appeared in glory;" Luke 9: 30, 31; hence Moses had been raised from the dead for the occasion, or it was a sight in *vision*. Christ appeared in glory on this occasion; but that glory was not his *permanent* condition; for he afterwards died. Moses, if really there, was there "in glory:" so saith the text: therefore he had been raised from the dead for the occasion; though it was not his permanent state, any more than that of Jesus at that time. We reply then unhesitatingly and unwaveringly—Moses was there by a resurrection for the occasion, or he was only there by a representation in *vision* of that glory which is to be possessed by Christ's followers when he shall actually appear in glory—"When Christ who is our life shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory;" Col. 3: 3. See also 2 Pet. 1: 16–18.

Thus, Prof., we have presumed to *controvert* your "incontrovertable instance in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body is in the grave." *Moses* was dead —*Moses* was buried; but *Moses* appeared in glory at the transfiguration—not Moses' *spirit*, as the Prof. affirms: no, it was *Moses*—the same Moses that died and was *buried*. His appearance is "incontrovertable" evidence of his resurrection from the dead, if he was *actually* there in person, even though he might fall asleep again to wait the revelation of his Master in his permanent glory.

"6." If *assumptions* could pass for proof the Prof. has carrried all before him. He has assumed, without a shadow of evidence, that "the Book of Revelation represents the righteous dead as indescribably happy, singing and praising God in a world of light;" thus he represents the Spirit of God as inspiring the Psalmist falsely when he declared—"*The* DEAD *praise not the Lord*:" Psa. 115: 17. His reference to Rev. 7th in proof that there is a superadded entity, called the soul—in man formed of the dust—is fatal to his theory. In the first place, the whole scene of revelation from chapter 4, onward, is a *visionary* representation of things future, and not of things then existing. Chap. 4: 1, John saith, he heard a voice saying "I will show thee things which must be *hereafter*." Hence, the vision related to a period, or periods, in the future. The vision in the last part of chap. 7, is clearly a scene at the end of the present age or dispensation; for they are in the "temple" of God, v. 15; and "*no man* was able to *enter into the temple* till the seven plagues" which "fill up the wrath of God were fulfilled" or completed. See chap 15: 1, 6–8. Till the wrath of God is completed "on earth"—chap. 16: 1, 2—no man can enter the temple of God: but the innumerable company John saw, chap. 7, were in "*His temple*:"—therefore it was *after* the "last plagues," and consequently subsequent to the resurrection, and not while the saints were dead. Besides, there must have been some materiality about them, as "God shall wipe away all *tears* from their *eyes*." We do not wonder the Prof. quotes *poetry* instead of the Bible to prove that dead men are "singing and praising God."

The Prof. goes on to say—"In the 5th chapter we have another view of the happy residents of heaven." We do not wonder he passed them with this single remark; for had he dwelt upon it, he would have brought out the fact that the scene is laid at the same period with chap. 21: 1–5, where there is "no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; neither shall there be any more pain." Such is the scene corresponding with chap. 5; for, saith John, "Every creature which is in heaven, *and in the earth, and under the earth*, and such as are in the sea, and *all* that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Such a scene belongs no where this side of that of chap. 21; and is at a time when death and hell are both destroyed, and there is no sorrow, nor pain in the universe of God. We may further remark, on this scene, that it is fatal to the existence of the *theological* hell; as every possible location is embraced in it, and "*every creature*" is praising God and the Lamb; so the wicked at that time, have *all* been converted or destroyed; for there is no wailing heard, no jarring hell-song, which theologically consists in *cursing* God and the Lamb.

The Prof.'s appeal to Rev. 19th, to prove the conscious existence of dead men's immaterial spirits, is equally unavailing; for the scene is laid at "the marriage of the Lamb, and his wife has made herself ready." Wonder if that will take place, Prof., till the church is completed and clothed with bodies like Christ's glorious body? See Phil. 3: 20, 21. Do immaterial spirits ride "white horses," Bro. M.? Please look at that chapter again with its connection, and see if you can lay the scene this side the resurrection of the saints.

The Prof. assumes that the expression, chap. 14, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth,"

proves the consciousness of dead men. He disregards the connection and the period. This testimony relates to a particular point of time in the prophetic chain. It is laid at a time when the seven last plagues were about to be poured out, and the general announcement of that fearful visitation had just been made. Either just before, in the time of, or immediately after those plagues, comes the time of glorifying the church of Christ, by their Lord's return "from heaven," and the resurrection of those who have "died in the Lord." From that period they are to be blessed; not in a disembodied state, but by a resurrection from the dead, to behold their Lord's glory "and be made like him:" see 1 John 3: 3. If, however, the words "Blessed," &c., related to the death of the saints, who die at that period, they have a clear explanation in the fact that the time spoken of was to be one of fearful judgments on the earth, and those who die in the Lord are taken away, or hid from the evil, and "*rest* from their labors." Here is no proof of their consciousness while dead.

Instead of saying, as the Prof. does, that all the Apocalyptic views "are essentially wrong," if his theory is not true; we say, the Prof.'s views of the Apocalyptic scenes, we doubt not, "are essentially wrong," and subversive of Bible truth, his additional poetical demonstration to the contrary notwithstanding.

"7." To the Prof.'s assumptions and questions we answer—The *saints*, or *holy ones*—for so the word signifies—who accompany our Lord from heaven, when he comes to raise those who sleep in Jesus, are expressly declared to be the *angels*. "When he [Christ] cometh in the glory of his Father *with* the holy angels:" Mark 8: 38. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father *with* his holy angels:" Matt. 16: 27. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels with him*:" Matt. 25: 31. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with* his mighty *angels*:" 2 Thess. 1: 7. Thus we have answered the Prof.'s questions with four texts; in which it is distinctly stated who the holy ones, or saints are, that accompany Christ on his return from heaven; and in not one of them, nor in any other text in the Bible, is there any mention of "the *spirits* of the sainted dead" coming with him on his return from heaven; but we are told that when the dead in Christ are raised then they "shall be *caught up to* MEET the Lord in the air;" 1 Thess. 4: 17. They are first BROUGHT *from the dead; not* from heaven: then the living in Christ are changed, and both classes "caught up *together to meet* the Lord;" and of course did not come *with* him. Thus we have again found the Prof.'s assumptions are neither "incontrovertable," nor the "Doctrine of Divine Revelation," but are fables of the Pago-theological schools; and he has utterly failed, in our judgment, to produce anything like proof of the affirmative of the question at issue. He has not shown by a solitary text that such a spirit as he contends for was "breathed into" the creature man which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground; or that any distinct entity called the soul was superadded to that man. He has not shown by any text of Scripture that the theological distinction of soul and body, making man a double entity, is true. He has not shown that any such soul as he contends for was ever separated from the body at death. He has not shown that there is any conscious existence of a soul of a dead man; but he has *assumed* these points throughout. "The Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground:" that is God's testimony. *That man*, by the inspiration of breath, "became a living soul," or creature: not, had another entity called the soul put into him. No such doctrine has a "thus saith the Lord" for it. "Life" did *not* "begin with the *union* of soul and body;" and "death is" *not* "a separation of two natures," but a dissolution of the man—"His *breath* goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that *very day* his thoughts perish:" Psa. 146: 4. No such doctrine is found in all the Bible as that *souls* depart to Paradise at death. Not one word in the Book of God is there that hints that *souls* "*re-enter*" bodies at the resurrection, as the Prof. affirms! No, the Prof.'s entire argument on this subject is made up of theological assumptions spun out of Pagan speculations, grafted on to Christianity between the second and fourth centuries, thereby corrupting the christian system and opening the flood-gates to the Papal apostacy, with its deified saints, worshipping them, and seeking help from them; bringing in the Papal purgatory, by which a wicked and designing priesthood could spunge the poor ignorant people out of money to get their friends prayed out of purgatory, with all the abominations connected therewith. The doctrine for which the Prof. contends is the very life blood of all the fooleries, corruptions, and blasphemies of Romanism, and "Spirit Rapping," now cursing the world and destroying its thousands and tens of thousands. It is the summing up, the perfection, the full development of the doctrine—"Ye shall not surely die." It maintains the *essential* man—the commanded man—the threatened man—the *sinning man* did not die, and cannot die. God saith, "*the soul* that sinneth it shall die:" "the wages of sin is death:" Ezk. 18: 4, 20; and Rom. 6: 23.

The Prof. says—"I shall devote no further space to the direct proofs of the single question whether or not man has a soul;" though he tells us he has "by no means exhausted the scripture argument." Let it be remembered the question is not whether "man has a soul"—that point we have never denied—but the question is—"Does the Bible teach that the *creature* man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a *superadded entity* called the soul?"

Now if the Prof. has not "exhausted the scripture argument" in the affirmative of this question, we beg of him to do it, and not to falter as long as the Bible, in his estimation, has any ammunition left in its store. This is the "single question" we agreed to discuss with him; and we will not be moved from it till he shall confess he has "exhausted the scripture argument" on the "affirmative." The "philosophy or metaphysics" of the subject we will not discuss. If the Scriptures cannot settle it there is no such thing as its being settled. And as the Prof. says, "If the arguments adduced do not prove it, nothing could," we conclude he declines bringing his Bible batteries to an "exhausted" state on the question.

In what way he is to pay his "respects more directly to his Reviewer of the Examiner," we shall see when his "next" appears. Till then the Prof. will allow us to pay our respects to him, by saying—Notwithstanding we may have been sometimes severe in our responses, it is not from

any want of respect for himself personally. His conduct towards ourself, in our personal interviews, has been such as to endear him to us. He has not, like nearly all our opposers, refused to come near us, but has often called to see us, and conducted in a friendly manner; and we shall still be happy to see him at any time, tho' we differ. We have no doubt he is in error on the question we have been discussing; but we were once in the same error, and we know how to make great allowances for those differing with us, especially if they reciprocate. Our readers, therefore, may be assured we feel kindly towards brother Mattison, notwithstanding the strong battling that has gone on between us. Toward him, personally, we have none but the most sincere good will. May the Lord guide him and ourself into all truth, and save us from all error, and bring us each to Life Eternal, through Jesus Christ.

REV. N. D. GEORGE AND MATERIALISM.—The Methodist Tract Society has published a Tract made up mainly from articles from *Zion's Herald*, which were written by Mr. George. As the matter appeared in that paper it was headed, "Materialism Anti-Scriptural; or, the Doctrines of George Storrs Examined and Refuted." The publishers of the Tract have done well to drop from the head, the word "*Examined*," for no man who has read our views, and regards truth, can say that this work is an *examination* of the "Doctrines" we hold; he has studiously avoided the whole foundation of our position; has scarcely taken a look at our superstructure; yet our name is blazoned at the head of the Tract which is almost exclusively an attack upon Eld. Z. Campbell. Bro. Campbell has written a reply which may serve as a suitable rebuke to Mr. George, and all others who, by misrepresentation and ridicule, think to pour contempt upon the views of those who differ from them. Bro. Campbell's reply, will make a 12mo. pamphlet of 36 pages. Price $3 per 100. It is headed—"MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL; or, *The Doctrine of Rev. N. D. George Exploded.*"

Thousands ought to be scattered, as the Methodists are giving their Tract a wide circulation. Will you send your orders immediately, that we may know how many to print? *Address*, "GEORGE STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*"

THE EXAMINER for this month appears later than we intended. We were obliged to wait several days for paper after our form was ready for the press.

We have again found it necessary to occupy more space in our columns than we intended. We trust our readers will bear with us. The issue for November we intend shall be early.

The Voice of Philadelphia.

To the Friends of Bro. Storrs and the Bible Examiner:

The friends in Philadelphia, wish to say through the columns of the EXAMINER, that they would like to see the sum of One Thousand Dollars raised for BR. STORRS, over and above all expenses of the EXAMINER: and we pledge ourselves for the sum of Two Hundred Dollars, or one-fifth of the amount. And, to let the friends abroad know that we are in earnest in what we say, we have the amount subscribed, and One Hundred and Twenty Dollars paid over to BR. STORRS. We hope the friends in different sections will take this matter in hand and place BR. STORRS in that position that he can give his time to his paper and preaching, and take no thought for the morrow, in relation to what he shall eat, and how he shall live. This subscription of ours is to be annually, and we hope others will do likewise. Yours truly,

The Brethren and Sisters of
Sept. 18th, 1854. PHILADELPHIA.

THE EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER acknowledges with gratitude to the *Donors*, and thanks to the God of all consolation, the following recent donations for his *personal* use and benefit. It has proved a mighty relief in trying circumstances. May the Lord reward all the contributors.

From the friends in Philadelphia, $120; from Paterson, N. J., $100; from a friend in Wisconsin, $8; Jane Morris, $1; Geo. Hill, $1; J. G. Baldwin, $1.

HELP FOR EXAMINER FOR THIS YEAR.—C. Sears, $3; J. T. Parker, $3; Joseph Eaton, $1; A. Pell, $1; Wm. B. Wade, $1.

☞ THE EDITOR will be at Paterson, N. J. the *first* and *third* Sabbaths of October, and at Philadelphia the *second.*

☞ NOTICES of several works, and some other matters are of necessity laid over.

"DEATH NOT LIFE."—Br. Blain has issued a new edition of this work; to which he has added, in 32 pages, "*A Review of Dr. E. Beechers Conflict of Ages.*" Good, we presume, but we have not space to remark upon it now. *Price* 25 cts. *Address*, "ELD. J. BLAIN, Buffalo, N. Y."

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Shall it be published *semi-monthly* in 1855? That will depend, under God, on its Patrons. We are willing to labor in its issue, and do the best we can to make it useful on the *Life Theme*, and other topics so far as time and space will allow. Yet we cannot do it without the *co-operation* of friends abroad. We have before stated that $900 is the least sum for which it can be published, without counting the EDITOR'S services anything: and this is probably less by $100 than the actual cost. We are willing to hazard our own support, without any pledges for us, provided the $900 are paid by the 25th of December next. This can be done if the present subscribers each send us *one dollar* for next year. But as all are not expected to do this, let those who wish the *semi-monthly* issue not only pay their own subscription but get at least *one* new subscriber. In this way, we doubt not, the amount named will all be paid by the time specified. After that, every dollar for the EXAMINER will be so much towards a compensation to the EDITOR. Shall we hear from all our friends without delay? Any person in the States collecting and sending us *five* dollars shall have *six* copies sent to his order, for 1855. The same in Canada for $6. Remember, our terms are "*Payment always in advance.*" We cannot depart from this rule.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1854. NO. 19.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT:

OR; THE HEBREW TERMS "RUACH" AND "NESHAMAH," AND THE GREEK TERM "PNEUMA."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 245.]

PNEUMA.— *Greek Term.*

There are a number of passages, some of them involving not a little difficulty in their exposition, which we will introduce here, and, as briefly as possible, endeavor to aid the reader in coming to an understanding of them.

Matt. 14 : 26, "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, it is a spirit (phantasma, not pneuma) and they cried out for fear." See also Mark 6 : 49.

The meaning of *phantasma* is an apparition, spectre; the Greek word is incorporated with our language now, and its form is phantasm. What the Disciples mean by a *phantasma* we are unable accurately to determine.

On apparitions generally, we would advise the reader to peruse the calm work of Hibbert; also let him examine in reference to *ghosts*, Reichenbach's Researches, edited and translated by Prof. Gregory, p. 123 to p. 127, where he will find interesting and useful information. Science is making havoc among ghosts and apparitions, just as enlightenment has happily relieved us of witches, and many other bugbears of our ancestors.

Luke 24 : 39, "a spirit (pneuma) hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

According to the 37th verse of this chapter, we learn that, when the resurrected Jesus suddeny stood in the midst of his disciples, "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit" (pneuma). To remove their fears our Lord addressed them in the words given in verse 39th, which have been already quoted.

It is enough to remark on this passage that, like Job 4 : 15, it says nothing about *human* spirits, much less about human disembodied spirits. They thought they had seen a spirit, but what kind of spirit we are not told; neither are we informed what order of being the Saviour referrred to in his address, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones." That there are living creature spirits, and it may be different kinds of them, we are far from disputing; with such we are not, in this treatise, concerning ourselves, our simple object is to determine what the Bible means by the human spirit.

Let it also be noted, the Apostles seem to have thought the "spirit," whoever or whatever he may have been, had not the property of *invisibility*; "they supposed" they had "seen a spirit," and how an immaterial being could ever be visible, is beyond our apprehension. The fact that they supposed a spirit could be visible, shows distinctly that the doctrine now common about spirits, was not held by them; at any rate it would appear they did not consider invisibility a necessary property of "spirit."

Jesus said, on another occasion, "God is a spirit," and because we know that he is "invisible", hasty reasoners leap to the conclusion that every being called a spirit must think, and be immortal and invisible also. To such persons it is necessary to say in a friendly tone, pause and consider. The apostle tells us in the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. that there are different kinds of flesh, or fleshly beings, and surely we may suppose there are diverse sorts of spirits, or spiritual beings. Nay, even essentially diverse things or beings may carry the same name, because to a contemplator there may be discoverable, from his stand-point, some line, perhaps a very narrow one, of resemblance between them. An angel and the wind may both be *pneuma*, spirit, and however widely different otherwise, they may resemble each other in their invisibility; so God is called *pneuma*, and the wind is also *pneuma*, or spirit, and one obvious mark of likeness is in their invisibility to our eye. Because the wind, like the galvanic fluid, is not an object of sight to us, it follows not, however, that it is invisible to every creature; because angels are usually invisible to mortals, no more does it result that they are equally concealed from all other eyes; and it would be as unwarranted to infer that, because all created spirits are capable of being made visible to intelligent creature eyes, whether fleshly or fleshless, that God, since he has been revealed as "spirit," can become in any circumstance an object of sight to his offspring as we see each other, or as angels behold angels. From this very omnipresence that seems to be impossible, though, as we judge, nothing save ignorance could discover this from the fact that he is called a "spirit". What the nature of the Divine Being is, appears to transcend the grasp of all-created intellect; "who by searching can find out God"? Deity may be spirit after his own kind, that is, *Divine* Spirit; just as creatures may be spirits of their own order, that is, *creature* spirits; and

surely we may safely affirm that there must be, in essential nature, or in the kind of spiritual substance, an infinite difference between them all and God, and that there may be a vast disparity between creature spirits among themselves.

In connection with the passage from Luke, we may specify another remarkable instance of hasty reasoning, it is this:—because Jesus pronounces such a spirit as he was referring to, not to have "flesh and bones," must we leap to immateriality? Is there no matter in the great universe but *"flesh and bones"?* What is carbonic acid gas? what is oxygen? what is electricity? what is nervous influence? what is light? what is the perfume of a rose? How varied, how subtile, how imponderable even, the forms *matter* assumes? Is there no possibility of a creature being material and yet not "flesh and bones"? Who shall say so without folly? So far from being necessarily immaterial, the writer of the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. makes mention of a "spiritual *body;*" and, indeed, an immaterial being, appears to our judgment, simply an absurdity. Every being must be a something occupyiug space,—he must have an essence, and that essence located, in all space or a portion of it. There may be inconceivable differences between the essences, substances, or *material* of beings; we may, without danger of presumption, affirm there must be such a difference absolutely between the Divine Agent and all his creatures. To say that God is immaterial, or that spirits are immaterial, is very like an assertion that there is no God—no spirit in the universe. The uncreated Being can be spirit and yet matter,—eternal, unchangeable, and all-pervading, of an order peculiar to himself; for to be spiritual is not to be absolutely immaterial; and intelligences formed by his hand can be spirit and essentially material, though they may not be "flesh and bones," but organizations or structures of a more ethereal cast.

John 6: 63,—"the words that I speak unto you they are spirit (pneuma) and they are life."

"They (the words that I spake unto you) are not to be understood literally, as if you were really to eat my flesh; but they are to be understood as denoting the need of that provision for the soul which God has made by my coming into the world."—*Barnes in lo.*

Acts 23: 9, "but if a spirit (pneuma) or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God."

So spake the "scribes that were of the Pharisees' part," about Paul, but as the words contain nothing about human spirit, the passage is excluded from consideration at this time. See remarks on Luke 24: 39.

Rom. 8: 10, "And if Christ be in you the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit (pneuma) is life because of righteousness."

In the first work we published on this momentous controversy regarding man and futurity, we expressed our opinion that this verse intimated a conditional hereafter to the spirits of pious men, understanding as we then did, that the spirit of man imported what it is generally supposed to do. A more careful examination of the Scripture teaching about man's spirit, and a prolonged consideration of the verse, has convinced us that we formerly misunderstood it; if this confession be deemed humiliating, we are perfectly willing to bear the shame, since we are conscious of a desire to advance in a better knowledge of the Word, and are, at the same time, alive to our own ignorance and fallibility. God is the only being who requires neither to learn nor unlearn; these are the unavoidable conditions of finite intelligence.

The verse before us has been employed lately by Prof. John Brown, of Edinburgh, in his work, "The dead in Christ," to support the opinion that the dead (dead?) are conscious, having his argument, as usual, based on the word "spirit," and, after quoting his remarks, we shall presume to offer a few critical observations upon them. He says, "The following declaration of the apostle Paul, in the epistle to the Romans, fairly interpreted, seems clearly to assert that the state between death and the resurrection is one of conscious activity and happiness:—'If Christ be in you,' if you be true Christians, united to Christ as dying and rising, 'the body is dead,' and must die, 'because of sin,' the first sin of the first man, and the sin, too, that dwells in us; 'but the spirit,' the soul, as contrasted with the body, 'is life,' shall live, 'because of righteousness,' or of justification,—shall live while the body is dead: 'and if the spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall' not only preserve the spirit alive, but shall 'also quicken your mortal,' your dead, 'bodies by,' (or rather as it is in the margin) because of, 'his spirit that dwelleth in you.'"

In our work, already alluded to, we employed this passage from Romans to carry out the idea of conditional immortality, having then a strong subcurrent in our mind, of the abounding notions concerning human spirits, but, when properly interpreted, the text neither supports our previous statements nor those of the learned and venerable Professor. Nothing but assumptions stand out from the extract we have quoted above.

1. One assumption is that the human spirit and soul *are one;*—he says "the spirit," "the soul," as if the two terms were mutually explanatory. It may be fashionable in creeds and sermons to employ phraseology like this, "the soul, that is, the spirit of man," "the spirit or the soul," but the usage is unsanctioned by the authority of inspiration. Indeed, the soul of a man is just the organized being man himself, and if at any time a contrast is drawn between his soul and body, life is assuredly the import of "soul" in all such instances, as we have tried to manifest in our work "Soul." The common idea attached to soul is that of human self, or personality, but it must be kept in mind that "soul" in the Bible it essentially different from "soul" in the creeds and pulpits, and, instead of contrasting the human soul or life, and the body, we should have expected a repeated contrast between the soul and the man—the being himself, and his physical dwelling-place, yet that is never once discoverable in the sacred volume. Without doubt it speaks of soul and body, but not so as to teach us that the soul was the man apart from, and residing in, his material abode.

So far from the soul and spirit being synonymous, it becomes us to speak of them as very distinct. Instead of writing soul *or* spirit, thereby expressing unity, we should say *a* soul and his spirit; "soul" designating the man whom the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, and spirit being the breath of life inhaled by his lungs. We have said so much on these points already, that we may be excused any enlargement at this stage.

2. If it be the spirit of man that is here mentioned, another assumption is that *it was ever conscious before death*, that it was ever the thinking agent man, properly speaking, at all. Man has a spirit, and if it is an axiom that spirit must be alive, and must think, and must think on forever, all that Dr. B. asserts, and all that was ever affirmed on the same subject by myriads before him, may be admitted without a moment's hesitation. But are these things self-evident? It is here said "the spirit is life," may a spirit not be so described, because it is essential to life, without being itself alive? Food is life to man, and so is breath, or the spirit of life that comes from God. Enough has been shown in the preceding pages to manifest what the spirit of man is, that has been so long mistaken for man himself. What an humbling thought that, along with others, we mistook the breath for the breather!

3. It is another assumption that the spirit spoken of by the Apostle, is the spirit of man. We feel a growing assurance that it is God's Spirit and not man's. The writer does not say, if Christ be in you, your body is dead because of sin, but *your* spirit is life, because of righteousness, he merely asserts, the body is dead, but THE SPIRIT is life. Who, or what is this "Spirit?" Much is said about a spirit in the context, and, as far as we can determine it is exclusively of God's Spirit that mention is made. In verse 9th, we read, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," and then, after introducing the verse under discussion, the Apostle goes on at verse 11, thus, "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." At the close of verse 10th, the writer declares "the spirit is life because of righteousness," and he continues to speak about the *same* Spirit in the 11th verse as just quoted, "but if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you," &c. A case could hardly be clearer, as we humbly think, against Dr. B.'s interpretation of Spirit here, as being the spirit of man instead of that of Christ; and, if the thoughtful reader will study the point with his Bible open before him, we feel persuaded he will agree with us. Let it be also noted, that the interpretation we give of "spirit" here is obviously the one approved by our Translators, as is evinced by their printing Spirit with a capital S, and not a small one, as we think would have been the case, had they supposed the reference to be the spirit of man.

4. The meaning of verses 10 and 11 seems to be the following, which we give in the paraphrastic form:—and if Christ be in you, if ye are true Christians, the body, or ye yourselves, are condemned to die, and must die in consequence of sin, (compare Rom. 5: 12, &c.); but the Spirit of Christ who dwells in you at present, is giving you life, opening up to you, as justified and pious men, the hope of a glorious future life through a resurrection from the dead; and if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead—as the first fruits of them that slept—dwell in you, as you are well aware he does, by the peace and light, the love and hope which are your great possession, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall ere long quicken your mortal bodies, or give you an immortal and incorruptible resurrection by, or rather because of the Spirit that now resides in you. Still the old doctrine comes up in new and vigorous forms, that the human spirit is not the man; and that saints have no hope of everlasting life except through a resurrection from the dust. No passing from death unto life; only from the grave to immortality.

5. We are only required now to meet an objection that may probably arise in some minds, it is this:—why make "body" in the phrase "the body is dead," equivalent to the ENTIRE MAN? We answer, because we find this done in a variety of ways all over the Book; personality is there connected with the organization, not with anything like that undefined and incomprehensible conception, a human soul, or spirit, as it looms forth a cloud-enveloped popular creation. In proof of the propriety of our interpretation, we refer to such examples as these—Gen. 2: 7, "God formed man of the dust of the ground;" 3: 19, "Dust thou art;" 6: 3, "he (man) also is flesh;" Ps. 103: 14, "He remembereth that we are dust;" Ps. 139: 15, "my substance," (*margin*, 'my body') or I, "was not hid from thee when I was made in secret;" Matt. 6: 22, "the light of the body (of the human being) is the eye;" Rom. 12: 1, "Present your bodies (yourselves) a living sacrifice," &c.; Heb. 10: 10, "through the offering of the body of Jesus," i.e., the offering up of Jesus; James 3: 6, "it (the tongue) defileth the whole body," i.e., the entire being.

1 Cor. 5: 3, "For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit (pneumati), have judged already as though I were present," &c. Regarding the phrase "present in spirit," Barnes on the text has these remarks:—"my heart is with you; my feelings are with you; I have a deep and tender interest in the case, and I judge *as if* I were personally present. . . . Paul meant, probably, that though he was absent, yet his mind and attention had been given to this subject."

1 Cor. 5: 4, "when ye are called together, and my spirit (pneumatos,) with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"The passage,' says Bloomfield, "may be rendered thus:—I do hereby direct that ye (being assembled together, and I being spiritually and virtually present with you, by the signification of this my opinion) do, in the name and in behalf of our Lord Jesus Christ, and acting by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, deliver the person so described." &c.

1 Cor. 5 : 5, "deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit (pneuma) may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

The "spirit" is either *life* here, or it is used as a periphrasis for the man himself. The end of the disciplinary excommunication was for the destruction of the offender's flesh, that the spirit, or that he himself, might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

Using the word "soul" as synonymous with "spirit," Bloomfield paraphrases the clause thus: —"that his soul, corrected, humbled, and reformed by these sufferings may be saved," &c. "His soul" being a periphrasis for himself, and this being employed, though without the warrant of Scripture, for "the spirit" in the text, shows the commentator, whose words we have quoted, understood the verse in the sense we have assigned it. Better, is the force of the passage, to have the flesh, or the animalism destroyed now under a severe judicial visitation,—better to lose even the present life itself than to remain unwarned and untroubled in the midst of sin, which has such a deadly influence on every moral being; as a result of a true humiliation and thorough purgation in the fiery furnace, one may ultimately phœnix-like, spring from the dust incorruptible and deathless.

1 Cor. 6 : 20, "glorify God in your body and in your spirit, (pneumati) which are God's."

Here, as we have remarked on other occasions, there is nothing about a rational, thinking, immaterial, deathless spirit. The command to glorify God "in your spirit," it may be affirmed, intimates that the spirit thinks and wills and loves. Then, would we answer, O friend of the popular systems, observe that your own reasoning lands you in the conclusion that the material frame must think also, and that is a horrible idea to one instructed as you have been. Are we not commanded to glorify God in our body as well as spirit? And if the command proves the spirit thinks, it must show that the body performs intellectual operations also; and if a spirit must survive death because thought is ascribed to it, the same fact would seem to compel us to infer that the physical and organic associate of the more ethereal division of human nature should escape dissolution likewise, which being a great absurdity, as is established by observation, however logical and congruous it may appear in the region of abstraction and speculation, warns us from concluding that, because any part of man happens in the Book to have thought connected with it,—be it called "heart, reins, bowels, or spirit,"—the author of inspiration does thereby teach us, that the said part actually performs the given function, and will elude the grasp of death. It is the BEING MAN who thinks. Sometimes the thought process, or mentalization, is conjoined with one part, sometimes with another, and sometimes it is even associated with its breath, or life-spirit, inasmuch as it is by the vital spirit every human function is generated and sustained. And what is man. "The Lord God formed MAN of the DUST of the ground." Gen. 2 : 7.

In a verse like the one we are considering, it is sometimes affirmed that there is a statement given of the two parts that compose each human being, the body and the spirit, meaning, of course, his rational and indestructible spirit. These two parts compose a man—then how happens it that after death the man remains as perfect as ever? He thinks as well, joys or suffers as completely; in a word, is equally perfect as prior to the disunion of these two parts. When the compound agent thinks, does it not seem to be a dictate of common sense that, if the parts are taken asunder, all the results of their union, such as thought, love, pain, pleasure, and voluntary action must terminate? Take away the silver plate from the galvanic battery, or the acid from its trough, will the flash be seen? will the message run along the wires? Is a part, in a word, equal to a whole?

On the supposition that this passage teaches the existence of two parts in man, will not the text in which "spirit—soul—body" occur, reveal three parts; and the words of our Master "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," announce the existence of many; and what must be astounding to every one wedded to common notions, the Great Teacher in these terms makes no mention of a spirit whatever. A most vital part, nay, the part, compared to which all besides is unworthy of being taken into calculation,—this very vital part ignored!

Without controversy, the text under discussion is simply a mode of expressing ENTIRE MAN, like the words of Jesus we have transcribed a few lines above. Body and spirit, being and breath, being and life, being and all its powers, visible and invisible, mental or physical,—let them all be consecrated to him who is their Creator and Redeemer. In the words of *Barnes*, "Let your entire person be subservient to the glory of God." Who has difficulty in understanding the force of these texts, "The Lord direct your *hearts* into the love of God," "Sanctify the Lord God in your *hearts*?" When glorifying God in our hearts is so readily understood, on what ground shall we make a mystery of glorifying him in our spirits? Give him all outward and inward reverence is the substance of the exhortation. Would that it were universally done.

[To be Continued.]

IDOLATRY.

BY DR. S. B. BARLOW, NEW YORK.

Mr. Editor.—Will the great problem of "Man's Nature and Destiny," ever get itself settled? Who could believe that that, the greatest of all moral problems, was yet a debateable question? Especially, who could believe that the Church, the orthodox Church, claiming almost to be infallible, whose Grand Muftis and learned Bishops, High Priests, and titled Dignitaries, blessed with the Gospel, a light which is capable of out-shining all darkness, should still be groping in heathenish and worse than Egyptian darkness on that great question which above all others is of the most paramount importance to every living son and daughter of Adam? And yet such seems to be

the fact. We see it everywhere in the Church from the highest to the lowest of its members, and in churches of all manner of names; they have adopted the heathen philosophy and theory of man's nature and destiny in point-blank and Heaven-defying contradiction to God's word in relation to it; and that too where that word is so plain that a way-faring man though a fool need not err therein. It is the *idolatry* of the Church! It is their idol, and it is questionable whether they will ever give it up and settle down upon the plain truth of God's word until the great day whose light shall blaze and burn the truth into every man's mind and conscience.

And can they benefit by the truth then communicated? I fear not. We are commanded to know the truth, to believe it, to live in it. To all men is given understanding that they may know it, and if men will cleave to error when the truth is so plainly revealed to them in the word of Jehovah, how will they answer for it in a day of accounts? Alas! I dare not answer how. Bishop Newton said of Lord Bolingbroke: "the Lord gave him splendid talents, but the Devil gave him the application of them." Are not many of our talented men and Professors fearfully linked in the same category with his Lordship? I was led to these reflections by an article in the Christian Advocate and Journal of July 13, 1854, signed G. P. D., in which he gives long extracts from Cicero on the immortality of the soul, extolling him and Plato and Aristotle to the skies as the great expounders of the truth on that great subject, without once hinting, or seeming to know that the philosophy of God's Book was opposed totally to those heathen theories, (devices of Satan) and contradicted them *in limine et extenso* as much and as plainly as any known truth contradicts its opposing error. Did G. P. D. know the fact that God's word entirely, directly, and pointedly opposed those very heathen notions? If not let me beg him to go once through the Bible, carefully sifting and collating every passage in it which has any even the slightest bearing upon that point—the soul's immortality, and the great question of man's nature and destiny; and see if he cannot come to a truthful understanding of the matter. What is to be the final result of the Church's error on these more than vital questions? Can men live in, and deal in, error of the most deadly and destructive nature all their days, when the truth lies open, world-wide before them, and come out of it at last unscathed? If so, what is truth for and what is it worth? "Ephraim is joined to idols." "The soul that sinneth it shall die."

Yours affectionately.

Henry Ward Beecher.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., Sept. 9, 1854.

Dear Br. Storrs.—This being Commencement week of Brown University, we have been favored with some superior emanations of gifted minds. On Tuesday evening our respected christian brother, Henry W. Beecher, gave, to a very crowded audience, an interesting discourse on the subject of Gospel missions, in his own original style. Our Boanerges commended himself, to every pious heart, by an impressive delineation of the absolute importance of vital godliness, as the grand effective element in this holy enterprise. Alas! the sacred pleasure of the occasion was diminished by the perception, that the expansive and independent mind of our brother has not emerged from the ignoble bondage of a traditional theology. Under the influence of human tradition, in the presentation of supposed barriers to the prosperity of the missionary enterprise, the eloquent speaker was pleased to class with the national sin of Slavery, (which elicited a faithful and scorching rebuke,) the prevalence of the belief, that DEATH, as an extinction OF VITAL BEING, will ultimately be the doom of impenitent men! In direct opposition to the pious intention of the speaker, here was the impious anomaly, of placing the very truth of "the faithful Witness," in the category of obstacles to the advancement of his own cause! If the words of Jesus Christ, Matt. 10: 28; teaching men to fear a destruction of "SOUL and BODY," in *Gehenna, subsequent to the first death*, do not plainly declare the truth we preach, and for which we are charged with hindering the Gospel our inmost powers love to promote; if the numerous declarations of the Bible, that God will *destroy the wicked* do not teach the sentiment Mr. B. repudiates, we ask him to inform us what words can teach it? If our brother believes that he can advance the cause of the Redeemer, whom we mutually serve, by teaching the heathen philosophy of natural immortality, and consequent eternal life of those who die in their sins; let him, at least, cease accusing us for teaching the testimony of the Eternal Spirit that "the wages of sin is DEATH." "The second death," as well as the first. Let him solemnly consider whom he is opposing, when he opposes the sentiment that in the "very day" of death, the "thoughts" of man "perish;" "also his love," &c. Do *we* persuade men to believe these things, or *God?*

What, we ask, is the objection of the talented preacher to these plain testimonies of the only reliable revelation? Did he adduce from the living oracles any counter testimony? Not a word. The sentiment does not chime with our brother's views and fancies of the dignity of human nature, or with his respect for it! This reminds us of the means adopted by another personage, to persuade the sinner to disbelieve the truth we preach, by flattering him with attaining to the high dignity of being "as Gods." Gen. 3: 5. Suppose a man charges our brother with lowering the dignity of human nature, because he denies that the human soul is really a part of the eternal and immutable essence of God: or because he denies that man was made higher than the angels. His answer to such a change, will be an answer to himself.

Finally, if Mr. B's. regard for humanity, or for the justice and mercy of God, is such as induces him to prefer the contemplation of innumerable intelligent beings existing to endless duration in sin and misery, to the contemplation of their annihilation, we must dissent from the horrible philosophy.

Yours, for the truth, HENRY GREW.

Dr. Clarke Again.

Br. Storrs:—That Dr. Adam Clarke should find himself "in a dilemma" when he attempts to explain a passage which is hostile to the *going-to-heaven-at-death* theory, is natural enough; and that he should at any time completely nullify this theory by his own express teaching, may well excite surprise. Has he done so? Let us see. The Doctor proposes to read 1 Cor. 15: 32 thus: "If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it advantange me? If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." His comment on the place is as follows:

"What the apostle says here, is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine, that *there is no resurrection;* for, if there be no *resurrection,* then there can be no *judgment;* no *future state* of *rewards* and *punishments;* why, therefore, should we bear crosses, and keep ourselves under continual discipline! Let us eat and drink, take all the pleasure we can, for to-morrow we die: and there is an *end* of us forever."

That the Doctor in this exposition faithfully echoes Paul's meaning, does not, it appears to me, admit of a reasonable doubt; but in doing so, who does not see that he subverts the *immortal soul* hypothesis, and thus becomes a co-worker with those who hold and advocate what *he* elsewhere calls *"the vile doctrine of Materialism!"* Possibly he had not recovered from the shock which the popular notion receives at the 18th verse, which declares that "if the dead rise not," "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED." Indeed, he appears to have been deeply imbued with the drift of the inspired Apostle's reasoning, and by making *future life* depend on the "resurrection," he establishes the fact that *"the dead know not anything."* In the light of this truth it is easy to explain another remark of the Doctor, in his concluding notes on this chapter. He says, speaking of the *resurrection,* "The Apostles were continually insisting on it, and exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness through it." He also says, "There is not a doctrine in the Gospel on which more stress is laid." All this is very plain, if the *no-resurrection* hypothesis involves the fearful consequence affirmed in the comment I have quoted, namely, that at *death* "there is an END OF US FOREVER." Had the Doctor seen this truth when he penned his note on Acts 9: 40, he would have escaped the "dilemma" which you remark upon in the EXAMINER for August.

Very truly yours,
Canajoharie, N. Y. RUFUS WENDELL.

DARK DAYS.—In the year 358, before the earthquake of Nicomedia, the darkness was very dense from two to three hours. Two years afterwards, in all the provinces of the Roman Empire, there was obscurity from early dawn to noon. The stars were visible; and its duration precludes the idea of a solar eclipse. At the return of light, the sun appeared first in a crescent form, then half its face was seen, and was gradually restored to its whole visible disk. In 409, the stars were seen by day at Rome. About 536, the sun was obscured for fourteen months, so that very little of his light was seen. In 567, such darkness prevailed from 3 P. M. till night that nothing could be seen. In 626, half the sun's disk was obscured for eight months. In 733 he was again darkened, and people were generally terrified.

In 934, Portugal was in darkness for two months, the sun having lost its brightness. The heavens were then opened in fissures by strong flashes of lightning, when there was suddenly bright sunlight. September 21, 1091, the sun was darkened for three hours. February 28, 1206, for six hours complete darkness turned the day into night. In 1241, on Michaelmas day, the stars were visible at 3 P. M. In 1647, April 23–25, three days, the sun was so obscured that many stars were visible at once. Thus says HUMBOLDT in Cosmos.

If we come almost to our own time, to May 19, 1780, history and tradition assert the occurrence of a remarkable day prevailing over New England at least, and considerably in some other places. It came on between 10 and 11 A. M., and continued until midnight, growing gradually darker and darker, even till 11 at night. Candles and lamps were lighted for the people to see to dine, and to perform work about the house. These became requisite before 12 o'clock M. In the evening, so dense was it, that farmers could scarcely, even with the aid of a lantern, grope their way to the barn to take care of the cattle. The birds retired to their roosts at 11, A. M., and the day was converted into night.—*N. O. True Delta.*

FAMILY PRAYER.—Nothing, I think, is more useful in a family than prayer. For a man to call his family around him, and, on his bended knees, with sincere devotion, implore Almighty aid for himself and his household, is productive of the most beneficial results. And O, my God, how few families in my neighborhood even erect a family altar in their houses! Arouse us, sweet Saviour, and help us to feel and appreciate this glorious privilege! It not only instructs the younger members, by the godly example set before them, but it leads on and confirms the older ones in the way of piety and holiness. It teaches them a sense of their duty, to be thankful to the great Jehovah for his aid and support, which they daily receive, instead of returning to rest without thinking from whence they obtain their protection. When they pour out their thanks to God, who will never forsake those who pray in a right manner, then their prayers come from the heart, and not from the lips only. Then, too, they obtain that inward consolation and spiritual comfort which God is pleased to bestow on his followers when they breathe forth their desires in humble supplication. The man who never prays in his family, who retires to rest like the beasts of the field, without thinking that he is dependent on God for everything that he receives, is bringing up his children and family strangers to God; he is making them blind in their own evil ways, and hence double guilt will fall upon him. I would entreat all heads of families to pray by all means; to never forget the duty they owe to their

families and their God, and to keep in mind that holy precept, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."—*Ch. Ad. and Jour.*

Prof. Mattison vs. Prof. Mattison!

Br. Storrs.—In the EXAMINER for Oct. 1st, Prof. Mattison called "your special attention" to the "case" of MOSES at the transfiguration, which he urged "as an incontrovertible instance, in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body it once occupied lay in the grave."

It may interest your readers to learn that the Prof. himself quite recently advanced an altogether different opinion on this matter! He published a work last year entitled "SPIRIT RAPPING UNVEILED," in which (on p. 36,) after stating what was "supposed" to have occasioned "the 'dispute' between Michael the archangel and Satan 'about the body of Moses,'" recorded by Jude, he says:—"If this explanation is correct (and to say the least, it is highly probable), it affords much ground for the belief that God had settled the 'dispute' by raising the body of Moses from the dead, and that he appeared on the Mount of transfiguration precisely as Elias appeared. As the saints are to appear with Christ hereafter 'in glory,' and the bodies of the just are to be 'raised in glory,' so of Moses and Elias it is said 'they appeared in glory,' which, WE THINK, implies the full redemption of both soul and body."

Thus, reader, it is evident the Prof. "is in a strait betwixt two." In "unveiling" the "rappings" he saw no necessity for allowing the presence of a *ghost* at the transfiguration—indeed, he argues well against that notion; but when his "superadded entity" theory is in danger of being "unveiled," he does not hesitate to affirm that "the *spirit* of Moses met Elijah and Christ on the top of Tabor near fifteen centuries after his body died, and while it yet slumbered in the valley of Moab!"

Oct. 16, 1854. R. WENDELL.

From J. W. Dye, Jordan, New York.

Oct. 9, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—It is now several years since I first read your Six Sermons, by which I became interested and fully convinced of the truth of the Bible doctrine, "No immortality or endless life except through Jesus Christ alone."

For two or three years past I have been a reader of the BIBLE EXAMINER, and am well pleased with it, and the manner in which it is conducted.

My interest in the immortality question suffers no abatement. It is my ground of hope. Jesus the great Life Giver came that those who would believe on Him—take the Cross and obey His commands—might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

I hope yet to see the truth of this most interesting subject prevail, and the Examiner shed its light into every town and locality, until men shall throw off those yokes of bondage—those creeds and confessions of faith which conflict with each other and with the Bible—and take the Holy Scriptures for the only authoritative rule of faith and practice, and there learn, that if ever mortal man shall obtain immortality, they must seek for it, by patient continuance in well doing—endure hardness as good soldiers for Christ—overcome the world as he overcame; then, when he shall come from Heaven, the second time without sin unto salvation, we shall, if sleeping, be raised; if living, be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye; then this mortal shall put on Immortality, and we be caught up to meet the Lord, and so be forever with the Lord.

I am glad that Prof. Mattison came forward to discuss the question now under examination by yourself and the Prof. in the Examiner. I think it must do great good; it has, and it will show the sandy foundation, the no foundation at all, upon which immortal soulism rests.

I have been sorry to learn that the Examiner has not been better supported—that you should be shut up to the cares of the office without compensation. But I am now glad to see that some friends have taken a good step, and you are likely to be relieved from those cares with which you have been burdened. As for myself I can do but little (having to labor with my hands from day to day, pay rent and support a family) but that little is done cheerfully. I hope all others will do what they can afford to do in this matter; then the truth will advance; we be benefitted and blessed in doing our duty, and you go on in the good work without embarrasment.

Enclosed you will please find $2, which I forward to help you for this year.

I hope you will be able to publish the Examiner at least semi-monthly next year; and I had rather pay $3, and have it weekly, than pay $1, and have it once in two weeks.

Spicy Words.

"MATERIALISM ANTI-SCRIPTURAL: or the Doctrines of George Storrs refuted, by Rev. N. D. George, N. E. Conference.

This work is published in Tract form, 48 pages—price 3 cts. Being so cheap it should be extensively circulated wherever *this miserable delusion* prevails. Thousands have already been disposed of, and we hope to send out many more."

We clipt the foregoing notice from *Zion's Herald*. When our friends have read it we hope they will not fail to order "thousands" of the *Reply* of Eld. Z. Campbell, which is now ready for delivery. The Reply is properly headed—"MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL; or, *the Doctrine of Rev. N. D. George Exploded.*" Br. Campbell was the principal object of Mr. George's attack, though professing to refute the "Doctrines of Geo. Storrs." Br. C. has left "Rev. N. D. G." in a "*miserable*" condition; not having even the "skin of his teeth" remaining. Send us your orders and scatter them by tens of thousands: it will always keep ahead of Mr. G.'s. Price $3 per hundred.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1854.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—One more number will complete our issue for this year. Shall it be published *semi-monthly* in 1855? To insure this we must have nine hundred dollars paid, on subscription or otherwise, before the January issue. This sum can be easily raised if our present subscribers will send us *one dollar* each, which may be done at our risk. It is just as easy to pay $1 within the next two months as at any future period. "*Payment always in advance,*" are our terms; and we are sure it is best for all parties. The subscriber reads his paper with more satisfaction, and we publish with less embarrassment. Shall we hear from you all immediately? We promise to issue only *monthly;* but if the $900 is received by Dec. 25th we shall go forward with the *semi-monthly.* Some have already paid $2 for next year; others, we know, intend to do so; yet we do not ask it; and should much prefer that we might be able to say the EXAMINER is sustained from the payment of $1 from each subscriber. Some will not renew their subscriptions, but if our real friends will exert themselves, we doubt not, the $900 will be paid by the time specified.

Any person in the states collecting and sending us $5, current money, shall have *six* copies sent to his order for 1855. Any one in Canada doing it shall have *five.* Direct, in all cases, "GEO STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*"

WE give the following from a *Preacher:* but he wishes us to withhold his name. He is one whose face we have never seen, that we recollect; but he seems in good earnest.

A PROPOSITION.

The BIBLE EXAMINER must, and will live. But it should do more than this; it should be some help to its EDITOR; and in order to have it do so, its friends must make an effort.

I observe by the Sept. issue, that some have proposed to pledge themselves for $2; this is an excellent idea, and I readily agree to do the same; that is, to continue my present subscription, and get two new subscribers, or pay over the $2 myself; and I hope every subscriber will do the same, and then BR. STORRS will have sufficient funds to employ some help, and thereby be able to bestow more labor upon the paper and in the field, and be saved from that very unpleasant position which he must now occupy, that of being cramped in financial affairs.

O! ye men who have this world's goods, stop for a moment and think of a man who has spent his substance and given his time to feed you and other starving souls with the bread of life, then lend a helping hand.

But I have another proposition to make,—Namely, that we learn the expense of publishing 1000 extra copies of the last number of this year's EXAMINER, and divide it in shares of 25 cents each, and those individuals who wish to take one, two, or more shares, do so, and take his worth of the papers, and scatter them in places where it is not now circulated; or perhaps where we cannot go to obtain subscribers; for by this means undoubtedly many will be led to subscribe for it who would under no other circumstances. Come, Brethren, what say you to this? let us hear from you.

Once more.—Br. Storrs must have 1000 subscribers to commence Vol. 10 with. He has now 900; out of these 900 subscribers there ought to be enough to get 100 more. I will pledge myself to put forth every effort to obtain 25 of them, and who will take the rest?

A SUBSCRIBER.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We will furnish the "*extra* thousand" copies of the last number of the EXAMINER for this year, for $1, 50 per hundred, provided, the cash for them is received before that number goes to press. That price only covers the cost of paper and press work, without charging anything for composition.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—If any of you have failed to receive either number for this year we will send it to you on the receipt of the notice. *No charge* will be made for the odd numbers.

Any subscriber who thinks we have wronged him by not issuing 24 numbers this year, if he will give us notice, we will allow him 17 cents in any books or pamphlets we issue, that he shall name.

BOUND EXAMINER.—Immediately after the issue of the December EXAMINER we shall have the numbers for this year bound in one volume. This volume, if we may judge, contains a greater amount of important matter connected with the *Life Theme* than any two previous volumes. The articles by Br. Moncrieff, on *Soul* and *Spirit* are worth the price of the volume. They embrace an amount of information on the question which ought to be in the hands of all who wish to understand the question; and they could not be printed and sold, alone, at much less price than we charge for the EXAMINER, which has an addition of a vast amount of other matter. The EXAMINER for this year *bound* will be sold at the low price of $1, if sent us free of expense in current money. The postage on the volume will be about 27 cents, if *pre-paid,* which

amount might be remitted in Post Office *stamps*. If any wish the numbers for this year in *sheets*, we will put them at 75 cts.

"God Died." So said *Henry Ward Beecher* of Brooklyn, N. Y. Will he please inform us who sustained the Universe when the *ever*-living God was dead? and who restored His vitality and infinite powers?

Henry Grew.

This expression seems to be a favorite one with Mr. Beecher, as we have heard of his using it more than once. We hope he will meditate on Br. Grew's questions, and if he cannot give both a rational and scriptural answer, cease to employ it. The Examiner is open for his reply. Ed. Ex.

Pick's Bible Student's Concordance is not to be had in this city or country, that we can learn. We sent to England for some last spring, but could not procure them at a price that would answer for us. If we can find any, we will give notice, and the first applicants will first be supplied. *Five* dollars will be the price, if we procure any.

Smokers Beware!—A leading medical practitioner in Brighton, England, has lately given a list of sixteen cases of paralysis, produced by smoking, which came under his own knowledge within the last six months.—*Phrenological Almanac for* 1855.

Is the Soul a Distinct Entity?

AFFIRMATIVE BY C. F. HUDSON.

Bro. Storrs:—I must still complain a little that Bro. Grew does not *recognize* the sense in which I have spoken of the soul as immortal. I do not ask him to adopt my expression, or even to allow it. Though I am sure our common argument would gain an advantage by allowing this use of terms, provided it be understood. For the phrase has been so used. To say nothing of its occurrence in the epistle to Diognetus, and in the Apostolic Constitutions, apparently in this sense, it is a fact which may mean something that Athanasius, the so-called father of Orthodoxy, in one instance speaks of the soul as immortal, while in the same treatise, (his 'Oratio contra Gentes,') he seems to speak as though, if men wish to be *actually* immortal, they must try for it. And his language on this subject generally accords with our view of conditional immortality. Neither the received doctrine of endless evil, nor of universal salvation, can be made out from his genuine works. Dr. Hamilton quotes him in one instance, but the book, (Quæstiones ad Antiochum,) is spurious. See Fabricus Bibliatheca.

In several of the Jewish writings, also, the soul seems to be called immortal in the same sense. The later Rabbis I cannot cite here, but an instance occurs in point in the Book of Wisdom, 2 : 23. "God made man incorruptible," (Greek, *ep aphtharsia*,) i. e., on the basis of incorruption, or such that his immortality was to be expected in the natural course of things.

Now Bro. Grew may censure this use of language if he pleases; still the fact of its use is historically important, and that he should *recognize* my use of terms, is simple justice. The question whether the soul *is* naturally mortal or immortal, I have all along held as unimportant. Whately says the same, and I find that others, learned men, holding to Life in Christ, have taken the same view. Whether the death of the soul shall be effected by forces from within or from without, by natural decay or by special judgment and infliction, we cannot tell.

Our respective comments on Mat. 10 : 28, I am willing to submit to the reader.

Upon Gen. 3 : 19, I might reply further, showing how the predicate is often anticipated in the subject, especially when a certain class of verbs is used. When we say, "A house is built," do we mean that the house exists before it is built? Grammatically, we do *say* it,—and by Bro. G.'s philology, we should *mean* it. I submit this point to those who have studied the laws of our imperfect human speech.

Bro. G. speaks of "the principle of life;" "the vital breath" returning to God who gave it; and "that mysterious principle." If he does not explain and solve this mystery, how shall I know but that it may be an "entity?" How could he dare even to call it a "principle?"

I now return to the list of texts proposed July 1, p. 197.

Job 10 : 19, 22, it will be seen at once, just as much proves the utter and eternal annihilation of Job himself, as it proves anything.

Ps. 6 : 5. Either David held the firm hope of a resurrection when he uttered this prayer, or he did not. If he did not, the Psalm simply proves that life and immortality were not yet brought to light. If he did hope in a resurrection, he did wrong to deprecate the gloom of the intermediate state. In fact, David is praying that his enemies may not have occasion for triumph in his untimely death. The Psalm proves nothing respecting the nature of the soul.

Ps. 30 : 3. Here "sheol" is translated "grave," but without warrant. The body was never buried in sheol. Nor was the pit named in the latter clause of the verse, a place of burial. Sheol was the place or state of the dead, wherever and whatever that be, but in which they were always contemplated as having a proper *existence*, except when the wicked are spoken of, and that without mention of the second death, as in Ps. 9 : 17. The 9th verse of this Psalm might be taken as a proof text of the distinct entity of the self or soul, from the body, if we were to insist upon niceties. "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee?" As much as to say, What is the body good for, when the soul returns to God who gave it? The true sense of the word *shahath*, translated pit,

might however be disputed, and I waive it for the present.

Ps, 88 : 11, 12, proves the same as Ps. 6 : 5.

Ps. 146 : 4. "In that very day his thoughts perish." This at the most would only prove the *unconsciousness* of the dead. The text does not kill the soul. But the word here translated "thoughts," is unusual, and seems to denote, not thoughts in the general sense, but *counsels, plans, devices, schemes,* or *fine speculations.* The verb from which it is taken is *hashath,* "to shine," "to be bright." The splendid hopes of the rich man, as told in Luke 12 : 16, 19, are a case in point. And the context would refer the thoughts here named to the devices which men found for their mutual aid, when they forget that their help is in God. The passage proves nothing in the matter of psychology.

Eccl. 9 : 5, 6. "The dead know not any thing." Your readers are all familiar with this text. The answer to the argument based on it, and also on the 10th verse, is very simple. We need only appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise. No one, who regards not only *what* he reads, but *where* he reads in the Bible, will look for a "Thus saith the Lord" in the first part of this chapter. And if these famous verses are allowed to prove any thing whatever, then we are shut up to the Epicurean faith, that "All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath." v. 2.

Isa. 26 : 19. If this passage proves that the soul is an attribute of body, or a result of bodily organism, it must also prove that the present and future *organizaton* is identical, or else our identical dust inherits the kingdom. The readiest way to lead men to deny the resurrection, is to burden the doctrine with such difficulties.

Isa. 38 : 18. Are the doubt and gloom of Hezekiah in his sickness to be taken as a Thus saith the Lord, and a revelation of things to come?

Isa. 53 : 12. "He hath poured out his soul unto death." We may discuss this passage without deciding the question whether Christ had a human soul. I do not interpret the incarnation as proving that Christ had such a soul, nor shall I quarrel with those who do. I refer to Dr. Bushnell those who wish to know what is to be said on this subject, and commend his "Christ in Theology" to all who love to think.

"His soul unto death." And what was it that died? It could hardly be his *breath,* for we do not say that a man's breath dies. Nor his *blood,* for the same reason. The death was evidently that of the body, and the question remains, was the soul some "mysterious principle," neither an attribute nor an entity, or was it so much of Christ as was not body, withdrawing from the "body prepared," (Heb. 10 : 5.) until on the third day it should be quickened by him who had power to lay down his life, and to take it again? Respecting the divine nature of Christ I do not know but Bro. G. and myself will differ. Be that as it may, he will hardly say that the divine soul, as named in Psa. 11 : 5, is a mere "mysterious principle," and no entity. The proper meaning of the term soul, as indicated by this and similar passages, will come up again.

1 Cor. 15 : 18. This text has been discussed in your paper for Aug. 1., p. 234.

vs. 44 and 47. We know the adjective "natural" is from the word *psuche,* and might be technically translated soul-ual. And "spiritual" is that which is suited or corresponds to the *pneuma.* This *pneuma* is called the "quickening spirit" in verse 45, and "the Lord from Heaven" in verse 47, and "Christ in us, the hope of glory," in Col. 1 : 27. Is this a "distinct entity," or only an attribute of the spiritual body? Now if the incorruptible body is quickened by *pneuma* as a distinct entity, is not the corruptible body also, by the terms of the comparison, enlivened by the *psuche,* as a distinct entity? The earthly body and its soul are each alike perishable. The heavenly body and its spirit, are alike imperishable. The relation of the soul to the spirit, and the redemption and preservation of the soul from death by the spirit, are matters I may treat of hereafter.

Thus, I have considered a series of proof-texts on each side of our question. Out of so many, my exegesis of some may have been faulty and erroneous; still I think that in the main I have been correct. It is clear, however, that we are not much nearer an agreement than we were at the outset. Our definitions of the "mysterious principle" would probably differ still. And it is also clear that we must come to definitions, and even to some theory, before we can understand each other, or even ourselves. This is what I call philosophizing, that painful necessity we are under in this world, of using our reason as well as we can for lack of angelic intuition. Our philosophy, of course, is concerned with the non-essentials of Christian faith. But non-essentials are very apt to grow in our estimation until they become an actual burden to our own faith, and a stumbling block to the faith of other men. It is because I fear this has happened in the present case, that I have written. And in your next number, after giving my definition of 'soul,' such as I think will meet the use of the term in the Bible, I shall try to show what I regard as the bearings and dangers of what seems to be Bro. G.'s view of the case. Meanwhile, with the highest esteem, I am

Yours in Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Cincinnati, Oct. 9, 1854.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs.—When our respected brother H. uses the term "conditional immortality" I understand him to "recognize" it as the scriptural doctrine. But I cannot allow him to represent "the soul as immortal," *previous to the fulfillment of the condition.* If Athanasius teaches, that "if men wish to be *actually* immortal, they must try for it," and also "speaks of the soul as immortal" antecedent to such trial, I ask Bro. H. to inform

us how he proves the necessity of a man trying to get what he already possesses. This is as intelligible as the proposition that three distinct intelligent persons constitute but one intelligent being." To be the reputed "father of (such) orthodoxy as this, is an honor no one need to envy.

I dissent from the opinion that "the question whether the soul is naturally mortal or immortal," is "unimportant." If immortality, or eternal life, is the gift of God *by nature*, then it is not the gift of God "*through Jesus Christ*," as the Scriptures of truth declare. Rom. 6 : 23. If man is immortal *by nature*, he is not dependent on a resurrection from death for eternal life, and the importance and magnitude of that doctrine is destroyed. The soul, which is supposed to be immortal, and never dies, being considered the essential and main part of man. If immortality comes by *nature*, it comes by the *first* Adam, not by the *second*, by whom alone man has life everlasting. 1 John 5 : 11, 12. Is it "unimportant" to rob the Saviour of this honor? He it is who "hath brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel*;" 2 Tim. 1 : 10. This glorious attribute pertains, *not to nature*, but to our Father's rich grace in the gospel. It is the crown of that marvellous system of redeeming love.

Gen. 3 : 19. I submit that our friend's remarks on this passage are entirely inadequate to set aside its obvious import. The declaration of "the Lord God," "dust THOU art, and unto dust shalt THOU return," is to *the entire man*, and not to an inferior part of man. It is a complete refutation of the opinion that man possesses "a distinct entity" not subject to death. The phrase "a house is built," is unmistakeable. The declaration that an *immortal* soul, or being, is dust and will return to dust, is a gross violation of truth.

I have spoken of life as a "mysterious principle." Br. H. asks, "If he does not explain and solve this mystery, how shall I know but that it may be an entity?" I reply, because the divine testimony most clearly teaches, that the organic man, formed "of the dust of the ground, became a living soul," or person, by the simple addition of the breath of life in his nostrils. Gen. 2 : 7. Is the breath of the nostrils such a distinct entity; such an immortal soul as reputed orthodoxy supposes man to possess? Such an opinion may well teach us to "cease from man *whose breath is in his nostrils*." In view of this latter passage, the theory of an immortal soul in man by creation falls like Dragon before the Ark of God.

I ask our brother to inform me why he objects to my calling animal life, common to man and all inferior living creatures, a "principle."

Job 10 : 19, 22, it is affirmed, "just as much proves the utter and eternal annihilation of Job himself, as it proves anything. In the absence of all counter testimony we might suppose this, although Job does not affirm that the state of "darkness" and "death" would be *eternal*. He describes *the nature and consequences of death*, so long as it reigns, whether temporally or eternally. What he affirms of the subject he affirms of *himself as a man*, and not of some inferior part of himself. He uses the personal pronoun, *I*, throughout his description, which utterly excludes the idea of any distinct surviving entity. Job indeed had hope concerning the future. On what was that hope founded? On the belief that he possessed a distinct entity which had escaped the power of death? Let us hear him. "MAN dieth (not an inferior part of man)—MAN lieth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. Oh that thou wouldst hide me in the grave—that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me! If a MAN die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." Job 14 : 12–15. The glorious doctrine of the Resurrection was THE hope of Job, as it was "the hope of Israel." Acts 28 : 20. "Moved by the Holy Ghost," (2 Peter 1 : 21,) he spoke of seeing his God, *not at death*, but when his Redeemer should "stand at the latter day upon the earth." Job 19 : 25–27. Christians of the nineteenth century of Messiah's era should learn of Job.

Ps. 6 : 5. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee." We have offered the common sense argument, that is David, Hezekiah, &c., desired recovery from sickness, because, in case of dying, they could not praise the Lord or have any remembrance of him, they never sang as the moderns do,

> "And when my voice is lost in death
> Praise shall employ my nobler powers."

They had no faith in the survivance of "a distinct entity" which would praise God. In reply to our brother's remarks on the passage, I observe, —It must certainly be admitted that David "held the firm hope of a resurrection," for he declared that God would guide him by his counsel and "afterward receive (him) to glory." Ps. 73 : 24. Br. H. affirms "if he did hope in a resurrection, he did wrong to deprecate the gloom of the intermediate state." The fair question in the case is, did he do wrong in desiring, (in submission to the divine will,) to remain longer in the land of the living where he could praise God, which the dead cannot do? Supposing he did do wrong in this matter, what does it prove relative to the question at issue? Nothing at all. Br. H. affirms also, that "In fact, David is praying that his enemies may not have occasion for triumph in his untimely death." The Psalmist uses no such plea in his prayer. His plea is, "For in death there is no remembrance of thee," &c. If, however, Br. H. is correct on this point, it has no relevancy to the question at issue. It is easy to *assert* that "the Psalm proves nothing respecting the nature of the soul." I submit the question to the intelligent reader; whether the declaration that "in death there is no remembrance of God," is no proof at all, that death destroys the memory, and, by parity of reason, other mental powers of man.

Ps. 30 : 3. It is *asserted* that "Here '*sheol*' is translated grave, but without warrant." That "the body was never buried in sheol. Nor was the pit named in the latter clause of the verse, a place of burial." Here are three *assertions*, but where is the *proof*? "Sheol was the place or state of the dead," it is said. I ask, is not the *grave*

the place of the dead? But, it is added, "in which they were always contemplated as having a proper *existence*, except when the wicked are spoken of, and that without mention of the second death." "Contemplated" by whom? Why does not our brother refer us to the testimony of the Holy Spirit involving such contemplation? Because some fallible men have so "contemplated," is no more proof of its truth, than the contemplations of the Papists, relative to purgatory, is proof of the truth of that dogma. I affirm now that *sheol* is properly translated 'grave,' that the body *is* buried in sheol, and that 'the pit' in the verse *does* refer to the "place of burial."

One testimony of the Eternal Spirit annihilates all these assertions of our brother relative to *sheol*. He will find it in Eccles. 9 : 10. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is NO WORK, NOR DEVICE, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR WISDOM in *sheol* whither thou goest." In the name of truth, I ask Br. Hudson what sort of "proper existence" is this for an intelligent being? The learned George Campbell who, in direct opposition to Eccles. 9 : 10, supposed the term *sheol* to denote "the state or place of conscious departed souls," not only admits that it often means *grave*, or sepulchre, but that in his time it was "the prevailing opinion among critics, that the term, at least in the Old Testament, means no more than *keber*, *grave* or *sepulchre*." Moreover, he even represents this state of the departed, which Br. H. contemplates as a state of "proper existence" for disembodied saints, as "not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad." The reader will please judge between our different camments on Ps. 30 : 9. "What profit," &c. As much as to say, "O Lord," if I die, I must cease to "praise thee" and to "declare thy truth." David's plea that if he died he should cease to praise God "a proof text of the distinct entity of the self or soul from the body," capable of surviving it to praise God with nobler powers! Alas! for the cause.

"Ps. 88 : 11, 12, proves the same as Ps. 6 : 5," our friend remarks. True, and both prove that death terminates all consciousness.

Ps. 146 : 4. "In that very day his thoughts perish." This, at the most (it is remarked), would only prove the unconsciousness of the dead. The text does not kill the soul. What kind of "a distinct entity," or soul is it, Bro. H., which is destitute of thought and consciousness? If the terms "*counsels, plans*," &c., is a better translation, it is essentially the same; all these imply "thoughts." Besides, your theory, so far from admitting that the "bright" "counsels," &c., of the saints perish in death, implies that they become brighter.

Eccles. 9 : 5, 6. I must express my surprise at the unwarrantable manner in which our brother disposes of this plain and positive refutation of the natural immortal soul theory. "We need only appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise."—On what authority does he attribute the words to "Solomon foolish?" Why, forsooth, because we do not find the words, "Thus saith the Lord," in the first part of this chapter. If this is good authority, then may we reject a great portion of the Bible. If we meet with any proposition in the writings of David, or Paul, or Peter, we do not approve, in the immediate connection of which, we do not find the words, "Thus saith the Lord," we have only to appeal from David, &c., foolish tn David, &c., wise! To the general principle of inspiration, there are indeed exceptions; but of these the Bible itself informs us. Job 42 : 7; 1 Cor. 7 : 6, 12. We have noright to make others. If we begin to do so, where shall we end? This is perverting God's word to harmonize with our own fallible opinions, instead of subjecting those opinions to the word which abideth forever. Eccles. 9th contains no "Epicurean faith." The word "all" is frequently used in the holy Scriptures in a limited sense. "All things come alike to all," (understood in a qualified sense perfectly warrantable,) is in accordance with fact. The reference is to similar providential events in the present state, happening "to the righteous and to the wicked." To the former, God overrules them for good. Rom. 8 : 28. This solves the mystery.

Isa. 26 : 19. All I contend for is, that the passage clearly implies that death is a destruction of *all life*, and that, for all future life, we are dependent on the divine promise, that "the earth shall cast out the dead." No absolute identity of the material particles is involved in the doctrine of the resurrection. Paul teaches otherwise. 1 Cor. 15 : 35, 44. We shall know ourselves to be the same intelligent persons. Carnal philosophy, not knowing the power of God, will "deny the resurrection," whatever view may be taken of the subject.

Isa. 38 : 18. "Gloom" is appropriate to death. Hezekiah knew better than to invest it with that halo of glory (as our poets do) which pertains only to the doctrine of the resurrection. His testimony accords with that of prophets and Apostles. Job 10 : 19–22. Ps. 6 : 5; 30 : 9; 1 Cor. 15 : 18; Isa. 53 : 12. Our friend commends Br. Bushnell's "Christ in Theology" to "all who love to think." I commend such to the Bible, as far more clear and definite. If any man can ascertain definitely Br. B.'s views of the nature and origin of the Son of God, from his writings, he can do more than I can.

Bro. H. asks, "What was it that died?" and answers, "The death was evidently that of the body," &c. Was this *all* that died, brother? If so, it follows that God never gave His Son, (who was with him before the world was, and who took the body prepared for him,) to die for us. The Spirit of truth answers the question in a manner more worthy of the divine wisdom and love. God made "his *soul* an offering for sin;" i. e., the life of His own Son, and not merely the life of a human body. "He (*the Son of God*) poured out *his* soul (or life) unto death." The Son of God said, "*I* lay down MY life for my sheep." "*I* am he that was dead." He did not say, I lay down my human body, or, my human body was dead. My soul laments that the transcendent wisdom and love of God, in the gift of HIS OWN SON, ("made so much better than the angels,") to DIE for the sins of the world, should be so egregiously disparaged by the substitution of the death of a mere human body!

1 Cor. 15 : 44, 47. "The adjective 'natural,'

from the word *psuche*," our friend remarks, "might be technically translated soul-ual." He will please remember this, as it proves the impropriety of those who imagine the term to signify an immortal distinct entity from the body. It is opposed to spiritual. It is asked if *pneuma*, called the "quickening spirit" in verse 45, and "the Lord from heaven," in verse 47, is a distinct entity, or only an attribute of the spiritual body? Certainly, "the Lord from heaven," is a distinct entity from his saints. Bro. H. appears to suppose that the "quickening spirit" refers to man. This is an error. The quickening spirit is *Christ*, who will quicken our mortal bodies by *his* spirit (not ours) which dwelleth in us. Rom. 8: 11. God "raiseth the dead" by His Son, "BY whom are all things," whom he hath "made a quickening spirit." The apostle presents no distinction between the body and the spirit of man. The contrast is between the "*natural* body" and the "*spiritual* body." It is raised a spiritual body, not by a reunion with any distinct human entity, but by the power of the second Adam, the quickening spirit, who is "the Lord from heaven." The entire absence of any intimation in the chapter of a re-union of "a distinct entity" with the body, or that such a reunion has any thing to do with our resurrection, goes far, of itself, to prove it a fallacy of vain philosophy. Not a word does the inspired writer give us of "the incorruptible body (being) quickened by *pneuma* as a distinct entity" of man. On this subject our brother has entirely mistaken the apostle. Respectfully and humbly submitted for the truth's sake in Christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Will the Russian Dynasty be Bound.?

Near three months since we wrote the following article for the EXAMINER, but delayed its publication for want of room. We are not sorry it was delayed, because we have had time to think more on the subject and to hear of the increasing probability that the Russian Dynasty is the Dragon power of Rev. 16 and 20, and will be bound; soon after which, as we think, will come the "battle of Armageddon" and Messiah's reign on the "Throne of his father David." But we shall still wait the developments of providence in the great and tremendous scenes just before us.

—

THINGS IN THE EAST.—We have at different times given our *opinion* in relation to the governments of Europe. What we have said relative to the *Napoleon Dynasty* being the "scarlet colored beast," of Rev. 17, and the *Russian* being the "Dragon" of Rev. 16 and 20, we have, as yet, seen nothing to cause us to waver for a moment; and no argument we have seen begins to balance, in our mind, the weight of evidence which we see in favor of the position we occupy. Still we intend to keep open to the conviction of *facts* as they shall occur in this matter.

It is our opinion still that the Russian Dynasty is the *dragon*, and that it will be "bound" before the final conclusion of this eastern struggle. We clip the following remarks from a letter writer from Berlin, found in the *New York Tribune* some time since. He says:—

I have had a conversation of the most interesting kind, with a person who has just arrived from St. Petersburgh, where he remained a considerable time, and where he was enabled to judge of the impression produced on Russian society by the events which are now passing. The Emperor Nicholas is more than ever under the influence of the old Russian party. He will not make the sacrifice of one of his ideas, and he persists in believing in spite of the checks experienced by his troops, that the moment has arrived for the accomplishment of his designs. * * * It is now quite evident that the military resources of Russia had been much exaggerated, in the same way as its other resources had been. The truth is, that Russia is in want of men and money, and that the immensity of the territory of which she is so proud, and for the extension of which she has made so many sacrifices, and so indefatigably intrigued, opposes the most serious material obstacles to her defense. Russia is punished by her very sin. Those same material obstacles have not allowed her to maintain an effective force of more than 120,000 or 130,000 men in the Principalities, notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary; and those obstacles also prevent her, in spite of her exertions and her successive appeals, from lining her coasts, along the Baltic and in Finland, with a force sufficient to defend them. You may regard this intelligence as positive. Every day Russia loses part of her *prestige*. The Emperor Nicholas had foretold the dissolution of Turkey. He has been too hasty, or rather he had deceived himself. It was the destruction of his own influence that was at hand. Many political men, even among the most enlightened, were, it is true, deceived like himself; but it is no longer permitted to-day to be blind to the result of passing events, and not to see that the influence of Russia has received a shock from which it can never recover. Russian society appears to be aware of it. Reasonable men in Russia are terrified at the situation in which the obstinacy of their master has placed their country; and the rest of the population, the small portion which reflects, is beginning to waver in their high opinion of the Emperor, and cease to consider him as a demigod since the signal defeats experienced by his armies. There is at bottom a latent but general discontent, which may sooner or later manifest itself by an insurrection, and bring about a catastrophe."

In whatever way the binding of this Russian power may be accomplished, we cannot, with present light, but regard the event as almost certain and at hand; still we wait for a further development of facts. To us, however, the prophecies appear clearly to point in that direction; though

we do not feel the importance of perpetually dwelling upon the subject, as if we feared our readers had no understanding or discernment themselves, and needed us to affirm and reaffirm our views on prophecies which cannot be fully comprehended till their final accomplishment. We doubt not that *all* prophetic expositors will ultimately find there is enough of error in their expositions to make it true, that "the Lord *alone* shall be exalted in that day."

Relative to the Napoleon Dynasty, and the *Projects* of the French Emperor, we are quite sure that neither *the man* nor his projects are at all understood: and we feel confident he has a part to act that will make them "that dwell on the earth" to "*wonder*" when they shall see it accomplished. Thus far he has been the most wonderful and mysterious of all the Princes of earth; what his designs really are, none can tell, but time will develope. That he has designs to accomplish abroad, or among the other nations of Europe, which are little thought of now, we fully believe. We copy the following from the *New York Daily Times*, for August 4th, as giving a little light on the subject. The Times speaks thus:—

"We said in January, that there are two parties in the diplomatic council of European Sovereigns, one for peace and one for war. We pointed out England, Austria and Prussia as the powers anxious to avoid war at any price, while we gave our reasons why Russia, Turkey and France may be considered as those constituting the war party. It is for our readers to judge whether events have verified these views. We say, now, only this much, that NAPOLEON III., at least *will not make peace*. Our private advices from Paris are of an interesting nature. 'The Emperor,' writes a friend of his Majesty to an eminent statesman in London, 'is as impenetrable as ever. No one knows what he aims at, but still he says now and then a word that creates hosts of suggestive ideas. His favorite *mot*, one which he often repeats to his confidential friends, is, for the moment, the following: "*Je ferai un coup d'etat a l'exterieur*,"—"I will make a coup d'etat ABROAD." And he adds that he will do it with less difficulty than the one at home cost him. He repeats these words to all the representations made to him about the eagerness of the nationalities—in Italy and Hungary—to respond to a call from France. He exhorts them to patience, until "*Je ferai mon coup d'etat a l'exterieur*." In the meantime you may be assured that he will not neglect any means, he will submit to every trial, he will be humble, obsequious, menacing, promising and flattering, by turns, in order to gain over Austria. But—this is the opinion of all the inmates of the Tuilleries—he is working at the destruction of Austria. He exerts himself to gain her *from* Russia, to beat the Czar with *her* armies, and then to destroy her, when she shall no longer have the Russian protection to back and to help her.'

"The French Emperor, it is written to us, anticipates a coalition againt himself, for the Spring, and so he works to counteract it. The camps at Boulogne and St. Omer were a key to his anticipation, the spots being well adapted to throw the troops in all directions, to the West as well as to the East. To assemble such a body of warlike troops and so many ships of all dimensions, at such places would have been impossible at any other moment without waking the strongest suspicions about invasion. Now there is no suspicion; on the contrary, people are exulting over the energy of his Majesty the Emperor of the French, who is just now a perfectly honest man with the English. Now, to use this favorable occasion is the aim—say the suspicious—of NAPOLEON III., who is to make his *coup d'etat abroad* next year."

That the French Emperor designs the overthrow of Austria, we have long thought. How he would accomplish it we did not know; it seems, however, that he would be glad first to get her weakened by a war with Russia; which most likely, Austria will avoid; but if Napoleon III. fails to draw her into a war in that direction, he may crowd her to join Russia; then we may expect Italy and Hungary, if not Poland, will be called to Napoleon's aid, or rather, he will offer them his aid to crush Austria; and in such a coalition there can be little doubt Austria must fall, if not Russia also. We simply throw out these thoughts for consideration, and add, it is to this last view, it seems to us, the prophecies point; but we wait further developments.

DEATH-BED CONVERSION.—Under this head we find an article in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, from which we give an extract below. It is *editorial*, and we presume by DR. BOND himself. We long ago lost all confidence in death-bed conversions. The holding out such a possibility to a sinner has no better foundation, in our mind, than Restorationism; and in principle is the same. Men neglect repentance till they see they *must* die, in expectation that then they shall find mercy, and others think they shall find the same mercy just *after* death. Neither class have any Scripture authority for such presumption. Dr. Bond speaks as follows:—

That the religion of a great number of the hearers of the gospel consists in a hope of being saved from punishment through the efficacy of a death-bed repentance, is a fact of common observation. This "religion" is the great barrier to the progress of true piety. It is the most comfortable refuge from Jesus and his gospel. It furnishes the most satisfactory view of God which the impenitent can entertain. It opposes the gospel with its own provisions. It wars against Christ with his own mercy. It claims license for transgression because of the awful suffering of our Lord for sin.

It makes him the minister of all evil; the precious bounty of God to the godless, and sensual, and devilish, that they, through him, may sin with impunity, neglect the great salvation with safety, and reach the glorious rest of the righteous by walking in the broad road to destruction.

Tried by human reason, this theory of salvation seems utterly absurd. If the purpose of God be to bring back the human race to holiness; if his moral government be directed to the eradication of evil and the development of good, surely he cannot sanction a mode of life by which the obstinately rebellious shall be accepted in death, and that conduct against which the most frightful threatenings are officially proclaimed, escape punishment in this world and find reward in the next.

To sanction a system like this would be to confound the consequences of virtue and vice, and to represent the Almighty as weaker even than earthly rulers, who have sufficient firmness to resist the importunities of the condemned, and inflict punishment upon the violators of law.

Two men begin active life together. One has faith in God, and fears him. He considers his threatenings; he ponders his promises. He decides to obey God. To do so costs him fearful sacrifices. He not only abandons habitual indulgences which it is so hard to relinquish, but he becomes an outcast from his family, and an object of vengeance to government. He serves God long, in wanderings, in want, in peril, in pain. He counts all things but loss that he may win the approbation of Christ, and secure the reward of the righteous. His life is a sublime spectacle of benevolence and self-denial: his history a continuous triumph of love over selfishness, of grace over sin. No visible benefit inures to him from this costly service to his Maker. Though he lives only for God, the Almighty does not interfere to screen him from the suffering and loss incident to his piety. He is left in the hands of a hostile community, and to the cruelties of a ferocious government. In his old age he is apprehended, imprisoned, and publicly executed. He goes to the tribunal of the righteous Judge eternal. He is judged according to his works. All intelligent creation assents to the commendation of his life, and the reward of his faithfulness.

The other man, upon a view of the good and evil of God's service, shrinks from the sacrifice required from the righteous. He loves this present world, and he determines to enjoy it. He devises a scheme by which he may do evil and reap good; sow to the flesh and reap the fruits of the Spirit; serve the devil and yet contrive to extort a reward from Christ. Hugely pleased with his ingenuity, he acts upon this scheme. He makes no dangerous profession of Christianity. He avoids all suspicion of Christ. He enjoys his estate; secures worldly comforts; gets honor from men; lives without restraint from the law of God; quiets conscience with his chloroform of death repentance; dies in his bed, with professions of contrition and confession of faith, and appears also at the bar of the righteous Judge to be judged by the deeds done in the body. In every respect his conduct presents a violent contrast to that of the other man. In every respect it has been such a life as God hates, and as he has sworn to punish. Yet, while the angelic hosts, and the spirits of the martyrs wait to hear the vindication of God's righteousness in the terrible sentence of eternal death, a voice of welcome comes from the throne: "Well done, good and faithful servant," is pronounced by the Searcher of hearts to the man who all his life has faithfully served the devil! What would be the effect upon the angelic hosts of such a sentence as this? How could they understand it? Would they be satisfied to learn that ingenious man had found a flaw in the plan of salvation, and by a technical quibble contrived to make the gospel a charter privileging sin, and offering the highest premiums for persevering iniquity? What would be the effect upon a wicked world, could a spirit thus saved come back to earth and give us the benefit of his experience? Would he turn many to righteousness, or *from* it?"

It is unnecessary to reason further upon this theory. It yields before the first summons of logic. If sustained, it must be by that faith in the word of God which removes the subject from the court below, and transfers it beyond the jurisdiction of human reason.

And, indeed, this is the defence relied on by the multitudes who have "fled for refuge to this hope set before them" by the devil, rather than to that set before them by God. They say that if the gospel does not advise this course to heaven; if, in fact, it earnestly dissuades from it, yet nevertheless it has admitted the safety of it, and left two roads open to glory—the one narrow, difficult, yet straight and sure; the other broad, easy, circuitous, and not altogether so certain, yet upon the whole preferable.

If this be so we must endeavor to reconcile our rebellious intellect to submission; we may not gainsay the gospel. But surely we may require to be well satisfied that the Bible does teach this extraordinary inconsistency, and does offer a Janus-headed salvation,—one face looking to war with sin and the other to peace with it.

Dr. Bond then takes up the case of what is called the "*penitent thief*," and concludes he was not the wicked person generally supposed, but an honest, though fanatical, Jew, who had been betrayed into some act of opposition to the Roman government which led to his execution. The Doctor's concluding remarks are as follows:—

Our conclusion is, that with no positive knowledge upon the matter, the probabilities deduced from the imperfect information afforded us, favors the supposition that the individual in question was not a ruffian—a hardened profligate, thief, and robber—convicted of sin upon the cross, and converted to God, sanctified in spirit, and prepared for heaven in his death agony; but that he was an honest and devout, though fanatical Jew, who had probably endeavored to serve God as his fathers did, and who received Christ when presented to him, though he was presented in the very agonies of his dying human nature.

The case certainly affords no example of what is

ordinarily called death-bed conversion. The man to whom Jesus is preached every day in his glory, as the ascended Lord, and who rejects him every day, is certainly not a parallel case to the man who, having brought upon himself the horrors of crucifixion by adhesion to the faith of God as preached to his fathers, in these agonies immediately receives the further revelation of Christ—though a Christ forsaken of men, and apparently of God.

That many serious people, sincere servants of God, and seekers of religion, known of him, though unnoticed by men, do, as probably this insurgent did, receive light and hope from God in their last hours, we believe; but that men who deliberately refuse the offers of salvation in order that they may live in sin, shall at last be accommodated with salvation and glory upon their own terms, is a notion sustained neither by the Bible nor common sense.

In the general view of this subject by DR. BOND we most heartily concur. We wish, however, he, or some one else who has the means of information, would investigate the genuineness of the text, in Luke, that states one of the malefactors acknowledged Christ. Two of other Evangelists affirm *both "reviled"* Christ. And each of the other three Evangelists state the fact of their crucifixion, but neither mention any repentance in one. There is some ground to doubt the genuineness of the account as found in Luke. There is nothing like it in all the Bible; and the account is the root of all presumption in sinners.

The Discussion.

SYRACUSE, OCT. 18, 1854.

Mr. Editor:—An imperative call to the western part of the State renders it difficult, if not impossible, for me to proceed with our discussion in your next number. Should I return to New York in time, I may do so yet; but if not, please do me the favor to insert this in your columns, that our readers may understand the cause of my seeming neglect. Very respectfully,

H. MATTISON.

DONATIONS.—A friend, $1; Catharine Colver, $2; friends in Philadelphia, on their pledge, $12; Henry Grew, $5; Lawrence Taylor, $3; Levi Boughton, $2; Cephas Boughton, $2; Franklin Morehouse, $1; Harriet E. Arnold, $1; Wm. Webster, $3; R. G. B. Woodward, $2; Lady in Philadelphia, $2.50; J. W. Dye, $2; J. S. Eckles, $1; Geo. T. Adams, $2.

"THE STATE OF THE DEAD, BY JOHN MILTON, author of Paradise Lost."—The chapters in Milton's prose works on this subject have been printed in a Tract of 24 pages, by H. L. HASTINGS, Peace Dale, R. I. We do not endorse every sentiment of this Tract, but it should be widely circulated. For the most part it is excellent, and will do much good. We are glad Br. Hastings has issued it. Price $3 per 100: 5 cents single. For sale at our Office: also by Walter Pratt, Windsor, Conn.: H. H. Dickinson, Hartford, Conn.: Dr. C. O. Towne, Providence, R. I.: and Ira Allen, Junior, Honeoye, N. Y.

"THE THREE WORLDS: or, *Earth's Past, Present, and Future.* By H. L. Hastings."—This is a Tract of 24 pages. Price $3 per 100. We have not had time to examine it, but presume it is good.

"LIFE ILLUSTRATED."—This is a new *weekly* paper, commenced this month by FOWLER & WELLS. Terms $2 a year in advance. It is a handsome folio of 28 columns, devoted to "*News, Literature, Science,* the *Arts,* to Entertainment, Improvement, Progress." It is designed to be the "*Best Family Newspaper in the World.*"

"THE ILLUSTRATED PHRENOLOGICAL ALMANAC," *also,* "THE ILLUSTRATED WATER-CURE ALMANAC, for 1855,"—Published by FOWLER & WELLS, 208 Broadway, New-York—have been received. These works contain much valuable and interesting information. Price 6 cents per copy; 25 copies for $1.

FRAILTIES.—All men have their frailties. "As I grow older," said Goethe, I become more lenient to the sins of frail humanity. The man who loudly denounces I always suspect. He knows too much of crime who denounces a fellow creature unheard—a knowledge can only be obtained by criminality itself. The hypocrite always strives to divert attention from his own wickedness, by denouncing unsparingly that of others. He thinks he shall seem good in exact ratio as he makes others seem bad."

The mere knowledge of spiritual truths and doctrine can save no man, let him be possessed of ever so great a degree of such knowledge; for it is only the life of love they are capable of that saves, and that only in the proportion it is formed into the man and vitally united with the truth.

Gentle Words.

Use gentle words, for who can tell
The blessings they impart?
How oft they fall (as manna fell)
On some nigh fainting heart!

In lonely wilds by light wing'd birds
Rare seeds have oft been sown;
And hope has sprung from gentle words
Where only griefs had grown.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, DECEMBER 1, 1854. NO. 20.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT:

OR, THE HEBREW TERMS "RUACH" AND "NESHAMAH," AND THE GREEK TERM "PNEUMA."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 292.]

PNEUMA.— *Greek Term.*

1 Cor. 7 : 34, "that she may be holy, both in body and in spirit;" i. e. that she may be entirely holy. See the preceding exposition.

1 Cor. 15 : 45, "the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."

"The word 'spirit' here applied to Christ is in contradistinction from a 'living being' as applied to Adam, and seems to be used in the sense of spirit of life, as raising the bodies of his people from the dead, and imparting life to them. He was constituted not as having life merely, but as endowed with the power of imparting life; as endowed with that spiritual or vital energy which was needful to impart life."—*Barnes in lo.*

This extract contains something very near the meaning of the difficult expression "a quickening spirit," though we do not consider *Barnes* has laid his finger on the exact and complete sense. To begin an examination of the passage on this occasion would not, however, promote our object, which is merely to determine what is meant by the spirit of man, and would require a longer space than we can afford in this work, after the magnitude it has already attained.

Before leaving the text we would suggest that a prominent inquiry, to the determination of its meaning, must be, when the constitution here disclosed was effected;—in other language, does "the last Adam who *was made* (or grew into) a quickening spirit," refer to the Saviour's first condition when in the flesh, or in his glorified and celestial state? Does it describe the Second man as the second man, or the Second man as glorified? The 46th and 47th verses perhaps intimate that the latter is the more correct idea.

Col. 2 : 5, "I am with you in the spirit." "The word 'spirit' here . . . is equivalent to what we mean when we say, 'my heart is with you.' He seemed to be beholding them."—*Barnes in lo.*

1 Thes. 5 : 23, "I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In his Greek Lexicon, as mentioned in our work "Soul," page 19, Robinson justly observes under *pneuma*, that "spirit, soul and body," is a periphrasis for the whole man. The reader will please to review what is written above in connection with 1 Cor. 6 : 20 (see page 49); this passage has been anticipated by us there, and we need not repeat at this time remarks suitable to all texts of this species when the judicious reader can easily re-apply our observations for himself.

Thus wisely writes Mr. Ham, in his "Generations Gathered," p. 112, "Paul does not say, 'I pray God your *spirit* or your *soul*, may at death ascend up as your disembodied self to heaven;' but 'I pray God your *complete* self,—your whole spirit and soul and body, be preserved free from all occasion of blame unto the advent of Christ, when he shall come to raise the dead to life.' Paul's prayer is, that the believers at Thessalonica may be found among the 'blameless,' who rise in the 'first resurrection at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." He concludes his observation on the passage with these words, "I would agree with those to whom Macknight refers, who consider that, as the Apostle's design was to teach mankind religion and not philosophy, his prayer means no more but that they might be *thoroughly sanctified*, of how many constituent parts soever their nature consists."

Heb. 1 : 14, "are not they all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs for salvation?"

The angelic beings compared to winds in v. 4 of this chap. (see page 33) are in the verse before us called "spirits." This word assuredly designates their constitution of being, though we are not very able to describe it. Desperate logic it is that leads any one to conclude that, because angels are spirits, the spirit of man is the man himself, an angelic being sheathed in flesh! Angels *are* spirits: man *has* a spirit. Thrice happy they among men who shall yet *become* spirits. There are not a few on the celestial roll who are heirs of the second form of humanity which is to be "spiritual;" not immaterial however, but substantial and visible, and denominated "spiritual" in opposition to the present which is animal or soulish, that is, a kind of organic existence, which is dependent for life on the respiration of oxygenated atmosphere. See 1 Cor. 15 : 44, 45, and 40; also Luke 20 : 36, "Neither can they die any more, for they are equal unto the angels."

Heb. 4 : 12.—We have nothing more to say in addition to what is written about this verse on p. 19 of our work "Soul." Still are we of opinion

that there is no necessity to enquire minutely into the reference of the terms "soul and spirit" here, or as to what is imported by their division, and that of the "joints and marrow." Our wisest course is to regard the whole as a full and strong assertion of the effects which the divine testimony can produce on the entire man. Like a sword it plunges into the depths of his being; and exposes his most secret thoughts and veiled depravities. "The meaning here," says *Barnes*, "is, that the word of God reaches the *heart*—the very centre of action—and lays open the motives and feelings of the man."

Whatever the Apostle may have embraced under "soul" and under "spirit," on this occasion, it is most apparent he did not understand the two as synonymous, according to nearly universal usage in our day, else he would not have written "soul *and* spirit," and we would have heard nothing of their divisibility from each other. And again, to assert he means by "spirit" here, what he is now supposed to express, is to utter what any one with as much authority can contradict, without making any reference to the direct opposition of the Biblical teaching about the human spirit, to the prevailing philosophy, or rather fancies, on the subject.

Heb. 12: 9, "Shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits and live?"

Some conceive the reference of "spirits" here to be to other orders in creation, the angels for example, who are called "ministering spirits" in Heb. 1: 14. This appears to us, we confess, forced and uncalled for. Because God is the Father of angels, does not appear a very conclusive reason why we should be in subjection to him; a reason drawn from his being the Father of *our* spirits would furnish more satisfaction. We are convinced "*our*" must be supplied to complete the antithesis, the first part of which is "the fathers of our flesh." By "fathers of our flesh," we understand our natural parents; those from whom we have inherited this physical being.

"The Father of" our "spirits"—what are these? or, to be more definite, what is the spirit we have each received from our divine Parent? In the Old Testament we have already found language perfectly analagous to this; indeed the expression before us is undoubtedly borrowed from the ancient records. Such as these are the passages we refer to:—Num. 16: 22, "O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh;" see also Num. 27: 16. Similar to this, likewise, is Job 12: 10, "In whose hand is the soul (margin, "life") of every living thing, and the breath (*ruach*, spirit, i. e. spirit of life) of all mankind;" and Zech. 12: 1, "The Lord . . . which formeth the spirit of man within him" (literally, in his inwards, in his belly). To save repetition, we must refer the reader to the explanations of these verses in the preceding part of this work: the index of the texts at its close will at once show him the pages we request him to examine.

"The Father of" our "spirits"—seems to describe the Lord Almighty as the Author of our life and all its operations. According to his own arrangements the physical germs of human offspring are derived from earthly parents; he nurtures in the womb these germs into perfect creatures, infuses life into each wondrous frame, and in the course of time preserves each in independent animated existence by the breathing of the vital air, and other kindly appliances and resources of his bounteous providence. Parents thus afford the material; he moulds the clay and sends forth into independent life the finished vessel—a perfect living child. They are instruments; he is the operating, vivifying agency. To him we are indebted for conscious being, and capacity for its varied functions and experiences.

As we have frequently observed in previous instances, there is not a word here about immortal, thinking, living, or immaterial spirits. Find these adjectives coupled with the human spirit where we may, they are never so used, even on a single occasion, in all the Book. The record teaches us nothing about man *as* a spirit, but of man's *having* a spirit, in virtue of which, while it is his, is also God's, or the spirit of life from the Creator. It is common to us with the inferior tribes. We have all *one* ruach or spirit. He is the author of our spirits, and the sublime results they originate.

Would not the full force of the Apostle's reasoning be expressed were we to omit some words from the text, and read it as follows?—"We have had earthly fathers which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto our heavenly Father and live?" i. e. for ever. It ought to be borne in mind that at best, as we consider, this reasoning is popular and not scientific, or absolute, for Jehovah is as much the Parent of our flesh as of our spirits, or of any spirit in the universe. The reasoning before us is more from appearance than from absolute fact; God seems to be more the author of our life-breath which is in his hand, than of our flesh;—of the "spirit of life" that supports us in activity and consciousness, than of the breathing form itself, nevertheless he is equally the author of all we are and all we possess. Hence, while we read of him as "the God of the spirits of all flesh," we also find him self-pronounced "the God of all flesh." Jer. 32: 27.

It seems proper to state that *Bloomfield*, after remarking on "the Father of spirits," that it is "a very peculiar expression and therefore variously interpreted," and, having mentioned an explanation similar to the above, continues thus, "It is . . better, with some eminent expositors, ancient and modern, (as Chrys., Theophyl., Pesch, Syr., Crell., Grot., Milton, Rosenm., Wolf, Middl., and Kuin,) to suppose this a *Hebraism* for *spiritual Father*, as opposed to our *natural* fathers; which, it is certain, is quite suitable to the context. Thus we have just after 'we shall live,' and at verse 10, 'that we might be partakers of his holiness.'—There is a reference to the work of *regeneration* effected by the Divine Spirit, whereby faithful Christians are said to be begotten again of God. 1Pet. 1: 3,—1 John 5: 18." The reader is left to determine for himself what seems to be the more preferable meaning. Whatever the sense is, the verse, at all events, gives no countenance to the popular dogmas about human spirits, which, in-

stead of being the spirits *of* men, are actually converted substantially into men themselves!

Heb. 12: 22, 23, "ye are come . . to the spirits of just men made perfect."

"The words 'the spirits of just men made perfect,' it is alleged, refer to disembodied spirits. The whole passage, it is evident, is highly oratorical; and, on this account, its expressions are to be treated with less critical severity than would be appropriate if the composition were more dispassionate. Whatever may be the meaning of this passage which is disputed, it is sufficiently clear that it is no declaration that the 'spirits of just men are their *conscious personalities*,' and that they are existing *at this moment* in their perfected state. An attentive consideration of the passage will show that all the particulars referred to are *future* and *not present*. Believers 'are come' to these privileges *anticipatively now*; they will not 'come' to them *actually* and *hereafter*. 'The church of the first-born' are at present only '*written*' or enrolled in heaven; their *names* are there *now*, their *presence* will be there when, from the generations of the slumbering dead, 'the children of the resurrection' shall be summoned to life. The phrase 'the spirits of just men made perfect,' is obviously an example of the figure synecdoche, in which the *entire nature* of the human being is expressed by a term which signifies only a part. Thus we use the word *roof*, meaning the whole house; and speak of evil-disposed men as wicked spirits."

"It is important also to note that the subject of the participle translated 'made perfect' is not the term 'spirits,' but 'just men,' and that the Greek would be more literally rendered thus—'ye are come . . . to *the spirits of the perfected just ones*,' (pneumasi dikaiōn teteleiomenon.) In the preceding chapter, the concluding verse, we are informed that the long catalogue of the Old Testament worthies will *not be perfected* until the entire Church of Christ *is gathered in from the generations*. 'God having provided some better thing for us, *that they without us should not be made perfect*.' The perfecting of the departed just ones, is at the period of resurrection, when 'this mortal shall put on immortality.'"—*Mr. Ham's Generations Gathered*, pp. 116, 117. * * *

Sec. VI.—Sometimes "spirit" and "soul" are used as parallel expressions of the idea of personality. For example,

Job 7: 11, "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit (i. e. in my anguish); I will complain in the bitterness of my soul," i. e. in my bitterness.

Job 12: 10, "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath (*ruach*) of all mankind;" i. e. In whose hand is every living thing and all mankind:—He preserves all alive.

Isa. 26: 9, "With my soul have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit within me will I seek thee early;" i. e. I have desired thee in the night; yea, I will seek thee early.

Luke 1: 46, 47, "And Mary said, my soul doth magnify the Lord (or, I magnify the Lord); and my spirit hath rejoiced (or, I have rejoiced) in God my Saviour."

"Heart" and "spirit," it may be added, are similarly employed, as in Ps. 77: 6, "I commune with mine own heart (with myself), and my spirit (or *I*) made diligent search."

Remarks.—1. The preceding investigation and accumulation of evidence distinctly shows, that the spirit of man is not the man, the thinking being himself, but the breath, or spirit of life, given to him by the Creator. Though not alive, though no more alive than the water and food we use, it is essential to our continuance in life.

2. All such language as "the living," "deathless," "thinking spirit" of man, and a "disembodied human spirit," are just immense absurdities. In using these expressions countless multitudes utter what they do not understand; and we fondly trust the time is coming when more accurate information will be spread abroad. We once were equally in darkness and have no ground for boasting.

3. It has also been discovered that the breath, or spirit, of life, is common to man with the inferior tribes.

4. After acquiring a correct idea of the spirit of man, how strange it sounds to hear *Goethe* for instance, thus express himself.—"If I work on till my death, nature is bound to give me another form of existence when the present one can no longer sustain my spirit." What a pity, moreover, if that was all his hope for futurity: its basis is as poor as the erection is presumptuous.

This spirit-language runs through all works, and hymns in a lamentable abundance, as every person can quickly prove to his own satisfaction. * * *

5. The preceding pages, along with the work "Soul," furnish demonstration that man must be *unconscious* between death and the resurrection. His "soul" is then alive say many, but his soul just happens to be himself—the dust-made man, Gen. 2: 7. His "spirit" is alive, others affirm, and his "spirit" is the breath, or spirit of life, when he receives from God Almighty for the animation of his being. In this manner all such passages as the parable about Lazarus and Dives, the verse about the Thief; Paul's being absent from the body, &c., can be proven in the clearest manner to mean something very different from the common interpretations of them. Let the reader take the case of the *Thief*, and apply the test he has been furnished with. The reclaimed malefactor expired on the cross, but his "soul," it is affirmed, was to go to Paradise on that day; the "soul" of the Thief, however, was just the man himself who went to the grave. He died,—his body died,—but his "spirit," it is said, went to Paradise; his spirit! why, that was the breath of life in his nostrils, and on the departing of which his thoughts would instantly perish. Ps. 146: 3, 4. Whatever the passage signifies, it *cannot* import that the man was that day to be in Paradise in a state of consciousness. Unless *he* was something different from a body, or a soul, or a spirit, and could be both dead and alive at the same time, he could no more be where he is ordinarily supposed to have gone on that day, than he could be there on the year before he was first in existence.

6. The preceding chapters, along with "Soul," furnish also irrefragible proof that Purgatory is an abominable, monstrous and mercenary device;

and that the worship of saints, and addressing petitions to them, is the merest folly, since it is applauding the unconscious, it is praying to those who are, in the interim, as if they had never been. The blindness, as well as the sinfulness, of such conduct may be easily manifested. Purgatory is old heathenism brought into the Christian church: the Protestant dogma of immortal-soulism, and conscious death, lead on naturally to the Purgatory of Romanism, and the wild dreams of Swedenborg about heaven and hell.

7. Thus we see more and more the importance of the RESURRECTION. There can be no consciousness till then. Man has a spirit now, but the hope of becoming "spiritual" in the constitution of his being, at the resurrection, is now mercifully brought within his reach. "It is sown a natural body," or saints lie down soulical or animal beings; "it is raised a spiritual body," or they rise spiritual, perfectly born of the Spirit, equal to the angels of God in heaven, fit for the kingdom which "flesh and blood" cannot inherit. See Luke 20: 35, 36, John 3: 5, 6, and 1 Cor. 15: 44, 50. The concluding two pages of "Soul" may be here examined as they bear on the point immediately in hand. Again we remark, happy they who shall cease to be souls, and become spirits, like the angels who are "ministering spirits," prepared for glory, honor, and eternal, or immortal life. Romans 2: 7.

8. The preceding Remark suggests another, and one which is worthy of profound consideration. It is this:—the misapprehension of the Book which has led to the belief that man is already substantially a spirit, for nothing is more common than the expression "the spirit is the man," leads every person to regard himself as already what the Bible declares to be ALONE THE INHERITANCE OF THE FAITHFUL. They only shall ascend to this the higher and enduring form of human existence; in fact, it is to a great extent the very salvation, when rightly understood, made known through the Son of God. The first stage or form of human being is the animal, or soulish, one; the second, which will be conferred on those who seek after it, is denominated the "spiritual" as described in the passages referred to in the foregoing observation. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." No doubt there is a limited spirit-birth even now received by believers, when they are reconciled unto God, and replenished with the emotions and desires of gospel-love; this, however, is simply partial, or a character birth, and is to be esteemed as an earnest of what is coming at the resurrection of the just, when the whole being shall undergo renewal, or be spiritualized, through the energy of him who was constituted "a quickening spirit." Hence that era is styled "the regeneration:" the immense privilege of being regenerated will then blossom out in its loveliness and fragrance. The worm Jacob will then be like one of the celestial messengers; he who in this stage was as the grass,—frail and fleeting,—will, in that age, resemble the perpetual mountains. In consequence of the dim, and often most incorrect, ideas of God's wonderful and merciful plans, proceeding from the belief that man is *already* spirit, the glory of the Redeemer is veiled and lost. This is the grand point we would call attention to as with a rod of fire. Men are led to feel independent of him, to calculate from the most fanciful data on permanent duration in the universe. So far from being led to discover that all their future, if they shall have any eternity, hangs on him, they see the very opposite; that a future they shall possess, some even go the length of asserting they *must* possess, as certainly as if he had never appeared on earth. Thus the world is encouraged to be *Christless*, even—alas! that it should be so—by some of the Saviour's true, but misguided friends. Instead of being "shut up to the faith," they are shut *out* from it; in place of it being the light to the path of eternity, the lamp is extinguished and virtually pronounced unnecessary. In the spirit of love to man we testify against this delusion being any longer cast into his thoughts; in the spirit of loyalty to the Saviour we entreat that he may be exhibited by the church, not as he is imagined to be, but as he is revealed in the Word. Till man is understood in his nature and necessities, how can the work of man's Redeemer, and elevator, and immortalizer, be rightly apprehended?

9. There is, we conceive, the amplest evidence, furnished in "Spirit" and "Soul," warranting us to reject the dogma of resurrection at death, an opinion entertained by not a few professing Christians. It proceeds on the assumption that man is not "dust," but a "soul," or a "spirit," in the popular acceptation, or something nearly akin to it. What, we would demand, is to go out of the body, is to remove from this material dwelling? Is it answered "the soul," that is the very dust-made being himself: is it again replied "the spirit?" that is, the life-giving breath in man's nostrils. What, we insist, is to spread its wings and depart to some mansion in the sky? "Man dieth and *wasteth* away, yea, man giveth up the ghost (expireth) and WHERE IS HE?" Job 14: 10.

The doctrine of the Resurrection is nearly excluded from all popular religious teaching now, and no wonder, for even where it is believed it occupies a very inferior position on the scale of truth. The ideas about "souls" and "spirits" going to heaven at death finished, to all intents, the doctrine of the Resurrection; this glorious truth, however, will again ascend to its sublime and all-absorbing elevation, when man and redemption are better understood. All hail to Him who is "THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE."

"The doctrine of the Scriptures," says a writer in *Kitto's Journal* for this April, p. 167, "which moved the ridicule of the sneering philosopher, was not any vague and comfortless, but scholastic, immortality; but the bright, and real, and grand, though despised *anastasis*, or resurrection; not the continuous life of that which never died, but the RE-LIVING OF WHAT HAD PERISHED."

—

SINCE the foregoing article was in type BR. MONCRIEFF has arrived in this country from Scotland. He landed in New York the 7th ult., in seventeen days from Glasgow, with his wife and only son. We were pleased to have their company

beneath our roof, after they had passed the perils and fatigues of the sea. After spending one week with us he proceeded to Canada West, where he designs, with his family, to fix his location for the present. We were sorry that he should think it best to go there, especially at this late season of the year. After he has had time to rest awhile, and fix on his future course, we hope to have communications from him for the EXAMINER.

We deeply sympathise with him and his beloved partner in the trials to which they have been subjected for the truth's sake. Though bigotry and prejudice are rampant on this side the Atlantic, as well as on the other, yet we trust Br. Moncrieff may not be made to feel its withering influence in his new and adopted home.

The respect felt for him by a portion of his countrymen will be seen by the following article which we clipt from "*The Edinburgh News*" of Oct. 21.

"SOIREE AND PRESENTATION.—On the evening of Monday last, the Rev. W. G. Moncrieff was honored in the Carlton Convening Rooms with a soiree from his friends, previous to his departure to America. The gathering was both numerous and respectable, every available place being occupied by some admirer of the intending emigrant. Alexander M. Bell, Esq., occupied the chair. After tea the chairman remarked that they had come to bid farewell to a gentleman who to many present was a private friend, and for whom they reserved a later and quieter leave-taking. To many more he was known only as a public friend, whose voice had breathed into them accents of love and counsels of kindness divine and human. He leaves his mission here, said the chairman, to enter on a new sphere of labor in another country, and wherever that may be, he has our heartiest wishes that his success in it may be as ample as his merits. A purse containing eighty guineas was presented by Mr. George Goodsir as a substantial token of esteem and affection to the guest of the evening from his numerous friends, including not only those who regularly attended on his ministrations, but also members of nearly every denomination in the city of Edinburgh. Mr. Moncrieff made a feeling and manly reply, expressing the pleasure he felt at seeing so many present who, although not agreeing with his theological views, were advocates for the right of every man thinking for himself, and the liberty to propagate those opinions which he conscientiously believed to be true. Speeches were afterwards delivered by Messrs. Jackson, Davey, Laing, Dowie, Sommerville, Wilson, and others. Some excellent singing enlivened the meeting, which altogether was a delightful one, and will long be remembered by those who were present."

From Samuel Brown, Milwaukie, Wis.

Br. Storrs.—As I believe you are laboring in the cause of truth, and for the glory of God; as one of his stewards that would desire to be found faithful, I wish to contribute my mite towards aiding you in your labors; and as I feel that the plan adopted by the Brethren and Sisters of Philadelphia must commend itself to all of like precious faith, and I trust will have its desired effect, and that each brother and sister will ask, each for themselves, what can I do? and what does the Lord require of me? and when each one shall have answered the questions on his knees before God, the result will be that brother Storrs will be placed in a situation above embarrassment, so that he can devote his whole time in the good cause in which he is engaged. To this end I enclose ten dollars, feeling that that is the least amount that God will accept at my hand; and I hope that I may be ever ready to respond to the call of duty when the cause of God requires it.

I wish you to apply one dollar on account of Bible Examiner for the year 1855, and the balance for your own private use.

Yours in the bonds of Christian love and affection.

From B. L. Buckley.

NEWTON HAMILTON, Pa., Nov. 7, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—Having a great sympathy for you and the cause of truth to see it spread abroad I enclose $5. Take one for the EXAMINER next year, and accept the balance as a free-will offering, which I intend to give yearly. I like the spirit of the brethren of Philadelphia, Paterson, and elsewhere, in striving to support the greatest of all causes. That the good Lord may bless you and them, and prosper the great cause of truth, is the sincere prayer of your unworthy brother.

I intend to try and obtain a subscriber or two before the 25th of December.

From Nathaniel Jones, Royalton, Vt.

Br. Storrs.—You will please find enclosed, one dollar for the Examiner another year. I don't know very well how to do without it. The leading doctrine—"No immortality, nor endless life, except through Jesus Christ alone,"—which it supports, I have been fully established in since first reading your Six Sermons—obtained of yourself at the camp-meeting in Chelsea, Vt., in 1843—and have done what I could with my feeble means, to help spread that very consistent doctrine, making the scriptures more harmonious with itself, with common sense; and the character of God in harmony with the declaration, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works."

Yet, doctrine alone, however correct it may *be*, will never save one individual. It must be connected with a practical carrying out, in a sober and godly life, as the grace of God teaches; *i. e.* "denying ungodliness, and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, [or doeth it] he hath both the Father and the Son."

I can bid you, I think, a hearty God-speed in your persevering and untiring labors to spread this glorious truth in the midst of so much popular tradition, and precepts of men, Jewish fables and commandments, " which turn from the truth."

But this one thing may we all *do*—" grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory both now and forever."

Nov. 7, 1854.

—

The following extracts from letters we intended to insert sooner, but they have been left till now by the length of the " *discussion*," which has occupied so much of our space.

—

From Isaac Dimmick, Vermillionville, Ind.

Br. Storrs.—I send you the names of two new subscribers to the Bible Examiner, to wit: Eld. Alfred Lathrop, and William Arnold.

Elder Lathrop is a regularly sustained Baptist Minister, in this vicinity—and has lately abandoned the traditions of men for the more sure word. He now preaches, Christ a whole Saviour —not one in part, who giveth only happiness to his Saints, while they possess immortality independent of him—but a Saviour who giveth life and immortality itself, and all things richly to enjoy; for they are dead, and their life is hid with him—and not that they receive this inheritance at death, but at the glorious resurrection, when Christ shall appear, then will they appear also with him in glory. These are among the truths that our brother publicly proclaims, and which he says, he must preach, if he preaches at all.

Brother Arnold is a substantial old pillar in the same church—and he says, he never did believe this dogma of innate immortality—but did not, till now, think it his duty to come out against it.

This I consider quite an accession to our cause in this place—and from this I am encouraged to look for more additions to the faith—because, the gospel is now *faithfully* preached—the public attention is awake to the subject, and many of the people seem to hear the truth gladly. But above all, why I am constrained to look for such a result is because the Lord evidently is with us.

August 15, 1854.

—

From Wm. B. Wade, Oswego, Ind.

Sept. 14, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—I see by the last Examiner that you are in want of funds to publish semi-monthly; and that your present number of paying subscribers is not sufficient to sustain the paper and remunerate you for your labor in publishing the same. Now this should not be so. The paper must not fail for want of funds to sustain you and your family, while you are engaged in the great and good work of publishing the truth of God's word, in opposition to the fables that are taught through the length and breadth of the land in this nineteenth century. The paper must not be crippled for want of funds. Although my means are very limited I send you one dollar to help sustain the cause of truth, and I will endeavor to do the same annually, while the Examiner is published, in addition to my yearly subscription for it. I have also obtained two new subscribers for it, with one dollar each for the same. I am glad to learn that there are brethren in various parts of the country that are willing to help sustain the Examiner and its Editor so long as it is needed to scatter the light on the great theme of life only through Christ, and a resurrection from the dead. Go on, my brother, in the good cause; and I trust that you, and the cause you advocate, will be sustained until the Lord comes.

Your brother, hoping for Immortality at his coming.

—

From a Brother in Wisconsin.

Sept. 12, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—I am grieved to learn of your embarrassments, and that the cause of God should suffer for the apparent want of dollars and cents in this land of plenty and wealth. I value the Examiner enough to pay five dollars once, twice, nay, *three* times per year, as long as I can get the money by earning it any way, and not " deny the faith." So, you can tell your Philadelphia friends, I will be one of the *twenty* to get the one hundred, and more, if needed, unless Gods forbid it, and that will be a sufficient reason to you and them.

—

From Geo. Hill, Meredith, N. Y.

Sept. 9, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—I consider your decision respecting the monthly issue of the Examiner a just one; but I am unwilling to receive it less than twice each month, or that its Editor should be in want of the *necessary means* for its publication.

How many among your readers, who welcome its message with joy, will share to furnish the needed sum for its semi-monthly issue?

The Examiner is a faithful advocate of the life theory, and is published for the benefit of its readers; and, as a lover of truth, I rejoice in the benefit derived from its pages. And shall our worthy *friend*, Br. Storrs, labor for nought? Enclosed I send one dollar for his personal benefit, and may others do likewise according to their ability.

I would like to have you write and publish a piece entitled—What can I do? For example; I am a man about 30 years old, and poor in this world's goods, but desirous to labor for the extension of Christianity among our modern idol worshippers.

—

From C. Sears, East Dennis, Mass.

Br. Storrs.—Enclosed I send you three dollars to assist you in extending your efforts to eradicate error, and to enlighten the inquirer after truth respecting the all important doctrine contained in the Bible.

The great question, " what is truth?" in relation to the future is, and has been, an all important inquiry with me for some time. Your Six Sermons on the question—are the wicked immortal? taught me that some of the prevailing doctrines, preached in our churches, may with great propriety be questionable in regard to their being taught in the Bible. I find some sentiments in the

EXAMINER (especially the editorial) that appear to me to be the true Bible doctrine; and I hope it will be sustained. I take a deep interest in the discussion with Bro. Mattison on the Soul, and hope it will be continued until the whole subject may be brought out to the view of an inquiring public, that those who can may read and learn for themselves. I hope this discussion will be printed together when it terminates. In conclusion, I wish to say—Let us so live that we may inherit Eternal Life.

—

From Wm. H. Fernald, Lawrence, Mass.

Sept. 9, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—Since reading the suggestions of your Philadelphia, and also others of your correspondents in the last EXAMINER, I have thought considerable of you and the cause you are laboring to sustain.

With yourself I have never had the opportunity of forming other acquaintance than that which is to be gained by reading your works; these I admit are *eminently* calculated to inspire and win the confidence of those who read them.

Since learning your embarrassment and of the loss which the cause is likely to suffer by the destruction of your property by fire, I consider that it is my duty to devote all the means that I can command to the support of the EXAMINER. In this, I cannot state definitely how much of the stock, which is thrown into market by your Philadelphia correspondent, I shall be able to take. I will do all that I can. His suggestion is a good one, and I hope it will be responded to in a manner so as to relieve the readers of your paper from the disappointment which now threatens them, and yourself of the embarrassment which you have already experienced. It would have given me pleasure to have forwarded you timely aid, but it was not in my power to do so. I might have written you a letter of sympathy long ago, and I doubt not but what such expressions would be appreciated by you, but feeling convinced that it was not so much your own gratification that you looked to the readers of the EXAMINER for, as it was that of the means by which the cause of truth might be sustained, I concluded that, how well-soever disposed one might feel in communicating such thoughts, such letters *alone* are not the safest means upon which to rely for support to *the cause*.

Hence I deferred writing you until now, for the purpose of arranging matters so as to be able to give you assurance of more support than formerly.

I shall write you again so soon as I can determine how much I shall be able to do. In this I forward two dollars for the EXAMINER another year.

—

From Freeman Dillingham, West Brewster, Mass.

Br. Storrs—Enclosed I send you three dollars. I wish you to send the EXAMINER to ——— ———, and the other two dollars apply to your own benefit.

My wife and myself feel very much interested in the good cause you advocate, although very unpopular with most professors of religion. Let us bear in mind, that the doctrines of Christ, our great life-giver, never were nor never will be received so long as men love the praise of their fellow creatures more than the praise of God. The rejoicing of the ancient followers of Christ was, the testimony of a good conscience; and that their children walked in the ways of truth; not because they belong with us, and subscribe to our creed, but their love and good will extended to all mankind, using all proper means to bring them to the knowledge of the truth.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life.

—

From Simeon Thos. Corby, Carbondale, Pa.

August 14, 1854.

Br. Storrs—The cause of truth is advancing in this place, notwithstanding the opposition it meets with from the different "orthodox" denominations.

The preachers manifest a zeal in opposing this doctrine which is not common with them in opposing error. Some of them may think they are doing God service; others say, they would not preach this doctrine if they knew it was truth! But while they cease not to speak evil of this way, there are some more noble that receive the word gladly, and search the Scriptures to see if these things are so. As we have been unable to obtain a speaker, we have to apply for the means within our reach to get light on this great truth. I accordingly send you four new subscribers for the Examiner.

"MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL: or, *The Doctrine of Rev. N. D. George Exploded;* by ELD. Z. CAMPBELL."

This is a thorough exposure of *Mr. George's* attempt to prove man is not a material being. Mr. G.'s professional effort was to "Examine and Refute the Doctrines of Geo. Storrs;" but in reality it was an attack on Eld. Z. Campbell, in which an attempt was made, by misrepresentation and ridicule, to throw contempt on the doctrine of immortality and eternal life through Jesus Christ *alone*. Br. Campbell has completely laid in the dust the Dagon of natural immortality, the favorite dogma of Mr. G. and his school.

Mr. Campbell's response should be scattered wherever Mr. G.'s work has gone.

Price $3 per hundred; *five* cents single. *Address*, "GEO. STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*"

—

DEFERRED ARTICLES.—Necessity compels us to lay over PROF. MATTISON'S article till next month; BR. HUDSON'S coming first to hand. Also, BR. HUDSON'S account of BR. LANGARL'S trial, by the Methodist Episcopal Conference, in Ohio; with the "*Prospectus*" of a new paper by these brethren; and various other matters; all of which we will endeavor to give place in the January issue.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 1, 1854.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We come to our subscribers with our last issue for 1854. For the faults and errors of the past year we hope our readers will make all the allowance they can, honestly. We do not claim infallibility, or that we have been free from errors in judgment, either in matter or manner; but we do claim the *intention* of doing nothing with design to injure one of the least of Christ's followers; how far we have succeeded the Judge of all the earth will soon decide.

We shall be sorry to part with any of our present subscribers, for any cause; but if we must, we commend them to God and His grace; and may His blessing attend them.

Those who intend to renew their subscription, for 1855, will confer a favor to remit the amount immediately on the receipt of this number. They may do it, by mail, at our *risk;* but they are desired to be careful to send us none but current money.

Our terms are $1 per volume *always in advance.* All papers not paid for 1855 will be discontinued with the end of this year. It *will not* be sent to *any one* for January unless payment is previously received. Let none be offended that we adhere *strictly* to this rule. We will not adopt the *dunning* system, *after* the paper has been sent. "ADVANCE PAY OR NO BIBLE EXAMINER," is our *business motto.*

We wish we could now say, the EXAMINER will be issued *semi-monthly* next year; but we dare not promise anything more than *monthly,* at this time; yet if $900 is received by the 25th inst., in subscriptions or donations, we shall go on *twice* each month next year. *Shall it be done?* If so, it must be done *quickly.* Write all names of persons and Post Offices *plain.* Address, in all cases, "GEO. STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*" Please do not put the number of the street on the letter, when sent by mail.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER *bound* for this year will be ready in a few days. Price $1, if sent us free of expense, in current money. If you wish us to pay the postage, you must add 27 cents in Post Office Stamps. We have put this work exceeding low, in hopes that it may be sold soon; and assured that any purchaser will be satisfied that he has the worth of his money.

We have still a few copies, bound, of the Examiner for 1850 and 1851, in one volume; also, 1852 and 1853 in one volume. Price reduced to $1,25 per volume. Postage on these volumes 31 cents each, if prepaid.

"SIX SERMONS *on the inquiry*—IS THERE IMMORTALITY IN SIN AND SUFFERING? *By Geo. Storrs, New York:* 1855." To which is prefixed "A brief *Biographical Sketch of the Author,*" with a *Portrait,* from a steel plate engraving. Also, there is added a Sermon on "*Christ our Life-Giver, or the Faith of the Gospel;*" being a view of the *Life* theme drawn from the Syriac New Testament, as translated by PROF. MURDOCK; the whole making a 12mo. volume—on good paper—and well bound—of 168 pages. *Price* 63 cents. Full bound in *gilt* $1. We thought some might wish it in this manner as a *Christmas or New Year's Present* for a child or friend.

This edition of the *Six Sermons* is on the basis of the original ones, entitled, "*An Inquiry: Are the Wicked Immortal?*" but revised and enlarged, and with a much larger type.

DISCORDANT OPINIONS.—We are all too apt to think others must see as *we* do or there can be no fellowship with them. Now we are as likely to err in this matter as others, but we abhor it in *ourself and all others.* The *positive* spirit on prophecy, relating to events future, or now passing, till more plainly developed—which is manifested by some—we deeply regret; because we think it tends to anything rather than the promotion of brotherly love. There are, at this time, several different opinions among those who believe the coming of Christ "*the second time*" is near.

One class have believed, and taught, that the event would certainly occur *this* year. Though we were perfectly satisfied, from the commencement, they were mistaken in their calculation of *time,* yet many of them were men we much loved and esteemed, and we did not feel called upon to take a public stand against them, believing that we could better serve them, and the cause of truth, by a kind course toward them, while at the same time they all understood we did not agree in their theory. We knew a short time would realize their expectation or satisfy them of their mistake.

Another class maintain that before Christ can come "the second time," Russia *must* overrun Turkey, and the Jews be restored to Palestine. With this view we do not agree, at all; but we do not feel disposed to enter into a controversy about it,

which must be exceedingly profitless, and call off attention from what we regard as far more important matters to this dying world. We do not affirm that this view is not correct; but we have no faith in it; and especially in the *positive* assumption that these things "*must*" be done "*before*" the Lord can come.

A third class agree with the foregoing so far as relates to Russia overruning Turkey; affirming that Russia is "the king of the north," spoken of Daniel 11th, and must overflow Turkey *before* Christ can come "the second time;" and that, hence, until Turkey is overwhelmed by Russia, we can have no scriptural hope of our Lord's return from Heaven. With this view we have no more sympathy than with the previous one. But, as we said of that, so say we of this; we do not say that *such events* will not take place *before* Christ's return, but to affirm that they *must*, positively, we think is overstepping our province as fallible mortals. *We* do not believe that Russia is "the king of the north." It is our *opinion* that any power that reigns over *Syria* is—for the time being—"the king of the north," spoken of Daniel 11th; hence that the Turkish Dynasty is *now* that power. If Russia, Austria, England, or France should become possessed of supreme power over Syria, *then* it—which ever it might be—would become "the king of the north." 'Till then none but the Turkish Dynasty occupies that position, in our opinion. Our views of Russia, Turkey, and France are known to our readers. No arguments, nor ridicule, that has yet appeared, has in the least shaken our mind; yet we do not affirm that we are right; *events* may convince us we are wrong in the matter. We have no theory at stake, and shall feel, we think, no mortification to find we are —just what we believe all others to be—*fallible*.

We entertain no views of prophecy that makes it necessary to put off the coming again of our Lord from heaven a single day. We are of opinion, that event may occur at any hour, for all there is in prophecy to hinder it; still, we do not affirm that there may not be events yet to go before it. We greatly desire that while entertaining different views on subjects relating to the great event of our Lord's coming, and freely express them, we *all* may do it in a manner which shall manifest that we remember our fallibility, and thus cultivate a mutual spirit of toleration. A contrary spirit can only *divide* but never harmonize us. The Lord *alone* must be exalted in *this* day, or we have good reason to fear He will not exalt *us* "in *that day*" of His Son's return from heaven; for, "every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted;" so saith Jesus, the Judge of the living and the dead.

Is the Soul a Distinct Entity?

AFFIRMATIVE BY C. F. HUDSON.

Bro. Storrs.—In order to close this discussion on my part with the December number of the *Examiner*, it will be necessary for me to throw one or two points into a separate article, to be published at your convenience. The "three *assertions*," which Bro. G. challenges from my remarks upon Ps. 30: 3, I think are amply proven in the paper I send you herewith. It includes a part of the argument of "the learned George Campbell," whose concession, Bro. G. thinks, helps to annihilate my assertions. That argument will be found in full in his VIth dissertation on the Gospel, and the perusal of it will amply repay the reader. The "one testimony of the Eternal Spirit" in Eccl. 9: 10, would be very decisive if there were no question about the identity of the witness. But if the "Eternal Spirit" is here testifying, pray what was it thinking about in the 9th verse, when it gave such Epicurean advice as to "live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity; for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labor which thou takest under the sun." And what kind of an "Eternal Spirit" is it that tells us "there is nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his soul enjoy the good of his labor." (Ch. 2: 24.) Bro. G. may affect, or may feel, great "surprise at the unwarrantable manner" in which I appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise. And he may be alarmed for the safety of a "great portion of the Bible." I think, however, the considerate reader will not tremble at my audacity, especially if the refutation of a materialist interpretation of the Bible is the only danger that threatens. My appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise might be defended from a single passage, (Ch. 1: 17,) if it were not justified by the whole tenor of the peculiar book of Ecclesiastes. Bro. Grew must know that the inspiration of the book is one thing; to believe that each proposition it contains is a divine revelation, is quite another thing. The study of the principles of interpretation would do no harm in a case like the present. That I am not mistaken in my view of the book of Ecclesiastes, may appear by a consultation of candid writers upon it.

If the scope of the book, as also of the book of Job, be an indirect argument for a future retribution from the apparent inequalities of Providence in this life, then the two last verses will shed light on the whole. And upon the last verse "God shall bring every work into judgment, &c," I may prosecute my appeal in the present discussion.

For, as all agree, there can be no proper "judgment" of man after death, unless a valid *identity* of the being judged, is preserved. And the importance of this whole discussion turns on the fact that a theory is broached, and is claimed to be the only theory consistent with the Bible, which to multitudes of Christian minds seems to destroy all possible identity between the present and the future man. Wherein does this entity consist?

Will the same *bodies* which we now have, appear in the judgment, and be immortalized, if we are found worthy of eternal life? Neither of us holds this; and we well know this gross style of faith has been the stumbling block which has occasioned serious error among good Christians, from the time of Synesius to Emanuel Swedenborg, to say nothing of the ribald infidelity which has made merry at the large faith of those who have so understood the resurrection.

Is it, then, an identity of *organization* that makes the present and future man to be the same? Certainly not; for as I have already remarked future bodies could not then be spiritual bodies.

Such are *two* theories, then, which cannot be accepted as justifying to human reason, or even to human faith, the doctrine of the resurrection and final retribution. Each of these theories seems to involve not only difficulties, but absurdities. If we shall have neither the same bodily particles, nor the same bodily organization, in the resurrection, then our future identity *by such means*, must be given up. You may resort to mystery, or to the power of God, to preserve our identity *by other means* which we do not know of; but if every other possible method is denied in detail, then the resort to mystery, or to divine power is simply ridiculous. Bro. Grew may say "the resurrection of men who have temporarily perished in death is no absurdity." (p. 235). That is his opinion. To my mind, the re-origination of a thing which has properly ceased to exist, is an absurdity. "One thing cannot have two beginnings of existence," says John Locke, who ought to be respected by my good friends, and whom I shall quote again before I close. True, a thing that has perished may by divine power be *replaced* by a new-created thing exactly like it. But that new thing will no more be the *same* thing than are two things, exactly similar, existing at the same time. To make two such things to be the same thing, is not an object of omnipotent power, for the same reason that God cannot make two and two equal five. I know it is very common, and often highly proper, to entrust to divine power what is impossible with man. But that is no reason why men should reduce the Divine Being to the limits of an absurd theory, and then call upon us to trust his omnipotence!

Two theories are now, I think, disposed of. Another theory is proposed by John Locke, to wit, that "consciousness makes personal identity," and how cautiously he handles it in his Essay, Bk. II, ch. xxvii, § 13. Locke should have said, "consciousness *proves* personal identity," just as the blossom *proves* the life of the plant, but does not constitute or create it. Locke's mistake here is that very common one which the logicians call that of the *cum hoc* for the *propter hoc*.

Two theories yet remain. One is, that a few particles, or possibly a single particle or atom of our dying bodies, is preserved as a nucleus, and will be the basis of our future identity. Of this theory there are various modifications. Whately states it without adopting it, on this wise, viz., that "For aught we know, the soul may remain combined with a portion of matter less than the ten thousandth part of the minutest particle that was ever perceived by our senses; since 'great' and 'small' are only relative." (Essays on the Peculiarities, &c., I, cited by M'Culloch, vol. ii, p. 484.) Here it will be perceived the Abp. speaks of the soul as a distinct substance or entity, and names this theory not to prove the identity of the *being*, but of the *body*, as possible in the resurrection. A very foolish version of the theory is given by Carmichael, in his "Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture," vol. ii, p. 314, 321. It is a significant circumstance that in reasoning on this subject men will flee from the impossible, even though they run into the ridiculous.

Upon this theory of an atomic or malecular nucleus, I have only to say, the thing is possible. It is also necessary, if the body and its attributes constitute the whole man. But it is not required by a fair interpretation of Scripture, and it is not needed, if we allow that the soul is a distinct entity.

This view of the soul accords, as I think I have shown, with the general tenor of Scripture language. That it accords with the language of mankind generally, is undeniable. That it accords with the general opinion of enlightened nations, and especially of Christian communities, is also undeniable. It is now denied by a school of Bible Materialists, and on this denial is rested, and so far hazarded, a most important argument respecting the final destiny of man. The effect is, the doctrine of Life in Christ is associated with the doctrine of Hobbes and Spinoza, of Epicurus and Thomas Paine, whose characteristic philosophy was a consistent and relentless materialism. This is also, if I mistake not, the "positive Philosophy" of Comte, and the practical philosophy of the lower grades of the phrenological school.

Now I have no horror whatever of speculative materialism, especially in this age when matter itself is getting somewhat spiritualized. The postulates of materialism can by possibility be made to consist with the truths of Christianity, and by a free use of the *argumentum hominem*, one may stagger the infidel materialist in his denial of the principles of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." And in a separate article I shall try to state what may be allowed, on this subject. But you well know, Bro. Storrs, that even if materialism were the true scriptural philosophy, the *Bible Examiner* cannot make it popular or acceptable with good Christians generally. And no eminent thinker among Christian men has ever held it. And I have engaged in this discussion for this reason, that the cause of a most important truth is being committed by a frail bark which Christians have rarely sailed in, and which in my opinion, and by the common opinion must sink by its own weight.

Is the soul a distinct entity? If it is, then the identity between the present and future man, instead of being a mystery, or a special work of omnipotence, is one of the most natural things in the world. And that the soul is a distinct immaterial substance, was the sentiment even of John Locke, the most unspiritual of all the respectable metaphysicians, and also held to life in Christ as firmly as does Bro. Grew. He speaks as distinctly as need be of "three sorts of substances,—1. God, 2. Finite intelligences, 3. Bodies;" (Essay, Bk. 2, ch. xxii., § 2.) And though Bro. Grew may laugh at the idea of an immaterial substance, still he may respect the opinion of Locke, that it is "as rational to affirm that there is no *body*, because we have no clear and distinct idea of the substance of matter, as to say there is no *spirit* because we have no clear and distinct idea of the substance of a spirit," Bk. 2, ch. xxiii. § 5. And he expresses the

common sentiment that soul or spirit is no abstraction, or quality of matter, thus:—"If we consider the active power of moving, or, as I may call it, motivity, it is much clearer in spirit than body; since two bodies, placed by one another at rest, will never afford us the idea of a power in the one to move the other, but by a borrowed motion; whereas the mind every day affords us ideas of an active power of moving bodies." (§ 28.)

And on the main question which Bro. G. and myself have discussed, Locke, who like myself, does not deny the abstract possibility of matter being made to think,—says thus,—"Possibly we shall never be able to know whether any material being thinks, or no; * * * I see no contradiction in it, that the first eternal being should, if he pleased, give to certain systems of created matter put together as he thinks fit, some degrees of sense, perception and thought; though, as I think, I have proved it no less than a contradiction to suppose matter (which is evidently in its own nature void of sense and thought) should be that eternal first thinking Being. * * I say this, *not that I would any way lessen the belief of the soul's immateriality.* I am not here speaking of probability, but knowledge." Bk. 3, ch. iii., § 6. And again, "*For my soul being a* REAL BEING, *as well as my body*, is certainly as capable of changing distance with any other body, or being, as body itself; and so is capable of motion." Bk. II., ch. xxiii, § 19.

And this brings us to the point which I named in closing my last letter. What is the soul? We must have definitions. What does Bro. G. mean, what idea has he in mind, when he talks about a soul; and what do I mean when I talk about a soul? Bro. G. has defined it to be a "mysterious principle." I think the subject admits of something more definite. But before giving my definition of soul I will ask,—if the soul is a quality, or a property, or an attribute, which God has pleased to superadd to matter,—*has the soul itself any attributes?* And if it has attributes, are they attributes of a substance, or *attributes of an attribute?* The question is certainly a proper one, and will impress the need of intelligent precision in this discussion.

Without undertaking, then, to explain the inmost nature of substance, I define the soul to be that vital power which makes man to be an individual, or a person. A power which is not produced by any organization, which is caused by no arrangement of atoms, as Epicurus supposed, which is *not the effect* but the *cause*, of the bodily organism. It is the power which energizes, informs, and moves the body; whose operations are of course impeded by bodily defects, though it may more or less repair those defects and overcome the weaknesses of the body. A power to apprehend truths which transcend all physical law, to conceive the ideas of the past and the future, fitted to aspire after the various forms of good, such as the noble, the beautiful, the just, the true, and the eternal, and to attain them by compliance with the proper conditions which God has imposed.

Does Bro. Grew think that such a power cannot exist without its appropriate organism? Let him consider, when he frames his argument to prove this, whether he proves *also that God* cannot exist without an appropriate bodily organization.

Does he asks whether the human soul, as I have defined it, is at all the same kind of thing with the brute soul, or with the vital principle in trees and plants? I answer that it is *analagous* to those forms of vital power; in that they, in common with it, are principles or producers of *individuality;* but it differs in that it peculiarly is a principle of *personality* and *responsibility.* It differs, therefore, not only in degree, but in kind.

Does Bro. G. ask whether the brute-soul, or the vital principle of plants, is a distinct entity? I answer, we have abundant reasons for thinking that they are; and these life-gems, or life-powers may be capable, in their own nature, of a separated subsistence; though by a general law they may actually perish with their organisms; while the human soul survives, by a higher law of God's moral government, until the judgment, or unto eternal life.

Does Bro. G. ask whether the soul, as I have defined it, is essentially active—that is, must it be conscious and thinking, so long as it exists, whether embodied or disembodied? I answer that it is *essentially* active, just as a watch spring is *essentially elastic;* but, to apply the illustration, the soul may be partially or wholly non-acting, in sleep or in death; just as the watch-spring may be in non-exercise, when unwound, or when removed from its appropriate mechanism, the watch.

Does Bro. G. ask whether I give undue advantage to him who argues that the soul is absolutely immortal? I will answer by a fair statement of that argument. It would stand thus: "Here I am, a man born of woman, of few days and full of trouble. By a thousand chances I might never have existed; and by a thousand dangers daily, I might die, and my body turn to dust. But I have a soul which no carnal weapon, or physical power, can kill, and THEREFORE I shall exist as long as the eternal Creator himself." Is Bro. G. afraid of this argument as too logically consistent? Must he deny the premise, lest the conclusion should be inevitable? Is the logic of this argument so invincible that Bro. Storrs is in duty bound to say, "The doctrine for which the Prof. contends is the very life blood of all the fooleries, corruptions, and blasphemies of Romanism, and 'Spirit-Rapping,' now cursing the world, and destroying its thousands and tens of thousands. It is the summing up, the perfection, the full development of the doctrine—'ye shall not surely die!'" (page 281.)

Be it remembered, that what Prof. M. happens to *believe*, has nothing to do with his *argument.* And logicians will think, though they may not say what they please about such an attempt to bring odium upon it.

Finally, Does Bro. G. ask what I hope to gain by such a theory of the nature of the soul, as an entity, and not an attribute of the body? I answer, First: I deem such a theory most consistent with the general tenor of Bible language, interpreted according to the principles recognized by all philologists and all common readers.

Secondly: I believe myself from the burden of proving a much disliked and much suspected philosophical tenet, before I can talk to my fellow men about Life in Christ. On this point I might enlarge in my own way, but prefer to quote the words of Whately, in his "Difficulties of Paul's Epistles," Essay VI. He says:—

"The importance of obtaining correct, and avoiding erroneous notions, respecting any point of doctrine, is not always to be measured by the intrinsic importance of the doctrine itself, or by the practical consequences *immediately* resulting

from this or that view of it. No error can be considered as harmless and insignificant, which tends to put a stumbling-block in the way of believers in the gospel, and to afford to infidels or heretics the advantage of a plausible objection against its truths. The genuine and fundamental doctrines of Christianity may become liable to the scoffs of some, and to the dread or disregard of others, from their supposed connection with such as are in fact no part of the gospel revelation. It then becomes a matter of importance to rectify even those mistakes which are in themselves of any moment; since we thus (to use the expression of Dr. Paley) 'relieve Christianity of a weight that sinks it.' God forbid that the Christian should deny or explain away any thing that is a part of his faith, for the sake of moderating the hostility, or escaping the scorn that may be directed against it; but as little is he authorised needlessly to expose his religion to that hostility or scorn, by maintaining or allowing to be maintained, as a part of the Christian revelation, any tenet (however intrinsically true) which the Scriptures do not warrant. The same authority which forbids us to 'diminish aught' not warranted of God forbids us also to 'add thereto.'"

Though Bro. G. should prove his theory of the soul's nature to be "intrinsically true," and *allowed* by the tenor of scripture language, it will still remain for him to show that it is also *warranted* as an essential part of the Christian revelation, before he insists upon it, or makes it a fundamental argument.

Thirdly, I hope to gain, by the theory of the soul as a proper entity, relief from what I deem unwarranted mystery, or extraordinary faith in what Bro. G. calls "the glorious power of God, in the resurrection, to secure our 'essential being' so far as conscious identity is concerned:" (p. 275.) My faith is not tried by any proper object of omnipotent power. But it does break down before what I and people generally deem an absurdity. Such I deem a second origination of one's own proper being, which Bro. G.'s theory seems to involve.

Fourthly; my theory relieves me of the special argument which Bro. G. must employ, though he may not be aware of it, to show wherein his philosophy differs from that of the materialists of past history generally. For my own part, as I look over this history, I find more points of similarity than of difference between the two. When Bro. G. or Bro. Storrs, advances any theory of our continued identity, it seems to me to involve either the Pantheism of the ancient Stoics, or, more likely, the doctrine of Democritus and of Epicurus, which made "all things flow," and which resolved all principles and all duties into accidental relations. This may startle my good friends, but it will not startle those who have read such writings as those of Culworth on the history of philosophy. Leaving the ancient materialism, the first, and almost the only marked development of Christian materialism was in the sect of Arabians, as they were called. Their doctrine I regard as the natural reaction of a crude philosophy against the extravagant Platonism which had now been accepted by the Church. They were refuted, however, by Origen, who though an ardent Platonist, was never dogmatical, and who was invincibly "adamantine" in argument, because he was so tolerant. The Arabians held that the soul, whatever it was, perished with the body, and was resuscitated, or re-created, or re-existed somehow, in the resurrection, of course by "the glorious power of God."

Whether Socinus and his compeers, who held life in Christ, were "Bible-materialists," I have not examined fully. If they were, the circumstance has passed unnoticed; they failed to vindicate the doctrine of Christian immortality, apparently, by burdening it with Unitarianism and Humanitarianism.

But for 200 years past Christian materialism has been almost unknown until its appearance in this controversy. The unfortunate effects of it I have already indicated. Multitudes of Christain men, and of intelligent skeptics, have plausible occasion for thinking that when they reject a certain doctrine of the nature of the soul, they have done with all arguments for its conditional immortality.

This position of things I regard as an evil, and only evil, to correct which I have engaged in this discussion. It might be pursued in its details, for months to come, but to no profit. I must return my thanks to Bro. Storrs and Bro. Grew, for their kindly bearing, though I think that my position, and many of my arguments, have been more or less misunderstood. I submit the whole, however, to be examined by those who have no fear that the premises of the soul as an entity, involves either the doctrine of a purgatory, or of the eternity of evil, as a conclusion. And having concluded, by the advice and with the co-operation of others, to undertake another periodical advocating our views, it behoves me to state that we design no warfare upon the philosophic views of the *Examiner*, though we deem them unsound. Our only wish is to give to the community at large a presentation of the doctrine of Life in Christ and of the Christian truths generally, unburdened with what we deem a false and unscriptural philosophy. We should fail of our purpose, if we condemned as incompatible with a Christian faith, the theoretic views of any who exhibit the Christian Life. All questions of secondary importance we hope to discuss as such; ever recognizing that happy inconsistency of our nature which makes it possible for us to embrace seeming truth, without being infallible, and thus to contend earnestly for the faith of Christ, without being dogmatic on the one hand, or latitudinarian on the other.

Commending you to the grace of God in all earnest effort to persuade men to Life in Christ,

I remain, yours truly,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Bro. Storrs.—Bro. H. concedes that "Eccl. 9: 10, would be very decisive," (*i. e.*, of our views of the unconsciousness of the intermediate state) "if there were no question about the identity of the witness." I have asked him for his authority to institute such a question, the manifest tendency of which is to invalidate the divine authority of the scriptures in general. I respectfully ask him to reply to my remarks on this subject. I ask him to consider, seriously, what more authority he has for denying the inspiration of Solomon respecting *sheol*, than the Universalist has to deny his inspiration respecting *future judgment?*

If the 9th verse is "Epicurean advice," then Epicurean advice is, so far, good and scriptural; and we may as well represent Gen. 2: 24, and various other passages relating to marriage (honora-

ble in all) as unworthy of "the Eternal Spirit." Justice to Solomon requires that his words (ch. 2: 24,) should be considered in their connection, as referring exclusively to temporal things, and are to be qualified by other declarations in the same record, *e. g.* ch. 12: 13. He is wisely showing the folly of modern and ancient merchants and others, in toiling and perplexing themselves to increase their wealth, instead of enjoying what God has given them. Is not this truly "vanity and vexation of spirit?"

Ch. 1: 17, is appealed to as a vindication of the charge of Solomon's foolishness in affirming that in *sheol* there is no knowledge, &c. "And I gave my heart to know wisdom, and to know madness and folly: I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit." What, I ask, is there here to sustain such a charge? If we understand him as searching to know the difference between wisdom and folly, by his observation of human actions and other means, is this "Solomon foolish," because it might be accompanied with some vexation of spirit? If we understand him as referring to his own excessive carnal gratification, as attended with vexation of spirit, I again ask, how is *this testimony* foolish? When our friend can adduce a divine declaration, in the book of Ecclesiastes, that Solomon therein "has not spoken the thing which is right," (Job 42: 7,) he may offer as a parallel "the book of Job."

"Brother Grew (*does*) know that the inspiration of the book is one thing, (and) to believe that each proposition it contains is a divine revelation, is quite another thing." I gave examples of this. But how are we to determine the exceptions? Who but the inspired writers themselves have a right to make them, as they have in fact done? See for example 1 Cor. 7: 6, 12. What better right has our brother to question the inspiration of Eccles. 9: 10, than I have to question that of Eccles. 12: 14, on which he proposes to "prosecute (his) appeal in the present discussion?" The writer gives no more intimation of being inspired in the one case than in the other. This matter needs to be settled. If writers may question the inspiration of passages which conflict with their theories, the Bible ceases to be a rule of faith and practice. The case now before us, is not one of "*interpretation*," the "principles" of which Bro. H. well advises us to "study." It involves the higher principle of *inspiration*. We agree as to the import of the passage. The alternative is, that its inspiration must be denied or our brother's theory must fall.

I cannot admit that it appears our brother is "not mistaken in (his) views of the book of Ecclesiastes," because other fallible "candid writers" agree with him. Ought he not to give us some just grounds for the opinion of those writers before he requires our acquiescence? Both he and they should have paused before they presumed to commence expunging from God's book. They should have asked, where will it end? Our brother cannot establish his views by limiting this excision work to the writings of Solomon. He must extend it to the writing of others who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost:" to the words of David, Ps. 146: 4; 6: 5; 115: 17; of Job 10: 18, 19; of Hezekiah, Isa. 38: 16, 19; of Paul, 1 Cor. 15: 16-18; aye, of Jesus Christ also, Matthew 22: 31, 32, who clearly teaches, that in order for God to be the God of the living, the dead patriarchs must rise from the dead, which is not true if the patriarchs had "a distinct entity" which is now living. In this case, God is the God of the living though there should be no resurrection of the dead. When our brother has disposed of these passages, I will give him another catalogue of similar import.

A certain "identity" is indeed essential to a "proper judgment of man after death." I protest, however, against all human philosophy, relative to identity, which contradicts the divine assurance that man's mental powers, *i. e.* his "thoughts," knowledge, and affections, "*perish*" at death. Philosophers are not agreed perfectly on this subject. Bro. H. thinks his "good friends" ought to respect the opinion of "John Locke;" yet he charges Locke with a "mistake" on this very subject! We have indeed no disposition to shield a palpable absurdity, or contradiction, with the omnipotence of Jehovah. But the limited mental vision of man often prematurely pronounces things to be absurd, which increasing knowledge has proved to be otherwise. This has been remarkably exemplified in the arts and sciences, particularly in astronomy. The Sadducees considered the doctrine of the resurrection absurd.

If the "reorganization of a thing which has properly (*i. e.*, entirely) ceased to exist is an absurdity," it is not involved in my views of the resurrection. I understand the inspired apostle to teach a connection between the "natural body" and the "spiritual," analagous, in some respect, to the seed of wheat sown and the body produced by vegetation. The latter is not an entire new creation independent of the former. So the spiritual body is not an entire new creation independent of the natural body. "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." Something *sown* is, in some state, *raised*. The absurdity, therefore, of one thing having "two beginnings of existence" is no more involved than that of an entire and absolute new creation. This view also implies that, in the spiritual body, there will not be an entire exclusion of "the same bodily particles" of which the natural body consisted.

If Whately is correct, in admitting so minute a particle of matter as he states, to be sufficient to secure the identity of the body, it follows that the identity of the body does not depend on its union with any distinct entity. Of this "atomic nucleus," Bro. H. says, "it is possible." He cannot therefore charge it with absurdity. But he supposes that "a distinct entity" is essential to prove "the identity of the *being*" or the *man*. I ask now, if as Mr. Locke admits, and Mr. H. does not deny, "that God can, if he pleases, superadd to matter a faculty of thinking" (Essay, vol. 2, p. 146, 167,) where is the necessity of this "distinct entity" to constitute the identity of the *being*, or the man? Is it not as easy for the Almighty to impart the faculty of thinking to the material organism, *raised* from the dust, as to impart it to such an organism *created* out of the dust? If Bro. H. admits, with Locke, the possibility of the faculty of thought being superadded to the material organism, he must not object to our denying the necessity of "a distinct entity" as involving absurdity.

Our appeal, respecting this matter, is not to "the language of mankind generally," nor to that "of Christian communities," but "to the law and the testimony" of God's truth. Our brother remarks, "I define the soul to be that vital power which makes man to be an individual or a person." If

so, it follows that Adam was not "an individual or person" previous to the impartation of this "vital power." I reject this *human* philosophy because it opposes that which is *divine*. Adam was denominated *man* before he had any "vital power" at all. Was he a MAN, and yet not "an *individual* or *person?*" God formed MAN (not a mere tenement for man) of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils (not "a distinct entity," but) the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Now unless Bro. H. will affirm that the breath in a man's nostrils, is "a distinct entity" from the man formed of the dust of the ground, *his* human soul is not to be found in this divine testimony of the nature of man. Will he affirm this? Is the breath in the nostrils a distinct entity from the material man, capable of a separate conscious survivance? Was it such a conscious distinct entity previous to its original impartation to the nostrils? The simple truth is, the wondrous organism, formed by infinite skill and power "of the dust of the ground," was man, an individual, a person, but without animation, until God imparted the breath of life, or lives. Then the *lifeless* man, individual, or person, or soul, "became a *living* soul," or person. When this breath departs he becomes, as the scriptures of truth declare, a dead soul or person. How then can Bro. H. think that his view "accords with the general tenor of scriptural language?" Can he adduce any plain testimony from scripture which even *apparently* contradicts that of Gen. 2: 7? I have adduced numerous passages to confirm the obvious import of Gen. 2: 7, which, in plain and positive terms, declare, not only that, in death, the *animation* of the physical structure is suspended, but that all its mental powers cease. The power of death's sceptre is vastly greater than most christians are dreaming about. I ask our friend to inform us how he reconciles these divine testimonies with his views; this would commend them to me far better than an appeal to the opinion of John Locke, or that of "good christians generally." I am not disposed to wait to enter the "bark" of truth until "the BIBLE EXAMINER" can make it "popular with good christians generally;" neither have I any fears for the "frail bark," so long as he, who can calm all surging waves, is on board with his holy prophets and apostles. I invite Bro. H. to join our honorable company.

He asks, "What idea has he (Bro. Grew) in mind when he talks about a soul?" I reply, my ideas are different at present from what they were when my faith stood in "the wisdom of men." If I say, there were one hundred souls on board a vessel which is lost; I mean that there were so many *persons*, as it is used in Acts 27; 37. When, by divine favor, I can adopt the words of Mary, "My soul doth magnify the Lord," &c., I mean that *I*, with all my powers, praise him.

Of *nesme*, rendered soul in the O. T., Taylor in his Hebrew Concordance, says, it signifies the chameleon, a kind of lizard, which has its mouth always open gaping for air, upon which it is said to live. It is rendered *breath* and *breatheth* in the following texts, and expresses natural life, whether in men or beasts. Deut. 20: 16; Josh. 11: 11, 14; 1 Kings 15: 29; 17: 17; comp. 21, where the *breath* of the child is called "his *soul*."

Of *nephish* Parkhurst says,—"As a noun *nephish* hath been supposed to signify the *spiritual part* of man—I must confess that I find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning. Gen. 35: 18; 1 Kings, 17: 21, 22; Ps. 16: 10, seem fairest for this signification. But may not nephish in the three former passages be most properly rendered *breath*, and in the last a breathing or animal frame?" Taylor says—Nephish signifies the animal life, or that principle by which every animal according to its kind lives. Gen. 1: 20, *every moving creature that hath the soul of life;* and verse 24, *let the earth bring forth the living creature, the soul of life:* and verse 30, every beast, fowl, &c, wherein there is life, the soul of life; Lev. 11: 46. Which animal life, so far as we know any thing of the manner of its existence, or so far as the scripture leads our thoughts, consists in the breath. Job. 41: 21; and 31: 39; and in the blood, Lev. 17: 11, 14."

Nesme and nephish, I understand, are the only two words rendered soul in the Old Testament. *Ruah*, translated spirit, Taylor says has the following significations"—1st, the wind, air, breath, Job 41; 16; Eccles. 3: 19. 2d., any temper, disposition, quality of the mind, good or bad; Numb. 14: 24; Judges 9: 23; 1 Sam. 16: 14, 15; &c. In particular, the spirit is put for vigor, liveliness or courage of mind; Gen. 45: 27; Josh. 5: 1; 1 Kings 10: 5; Job. 6: 4; 32: 18. 3rd. The spirit or principle of affections in brutes; Eccles. 3: 21. 4th .The Spirit of God. 5th. Any spirit or ghost; Job. 4; 15."

Of *Psyche*, Parkhurst says—"It means breath; animal life; a living animal that lives by breathing; the human body though dead; the human soul or spirit as distinguished from the body; the mind, disposition," &c. This term is rendered life and soul in various passages. *Pneuma* is rendered both *spirit* and *life*, in the margin *breath*, James 2: 26. Rev. 13: 15.

I ask every candid reader, if it is not evident that reference to the original terms translated soul and spirit can never sustain the popular opinion that man possesses "a distinct entity" which can survive his animal frame?

Bro. H. asks "if the soul is a quality, or a property, or an attribute which God pleased to add to matter,—*has the soul itself* any attributes?" I reply the "living soul" is *the man;* the material organization to which God was pleased to add the breath of life. *Man* possesses attributes. He has no "distinct entity," call it soul, or what you please, possessing "quality, or a property, or an attribute" independent of the material organization. The breath of life, or "soul of life," Gen. 1: 20, (Heb.) is a quality or a property; but it is not a distinct conscious entity. Is not this "intelligent precision?" I am aware that it will not chime at all with my friend's erroneous theory.

He supposes the soul to be a "power which energises, informs, and moves the body." He, however, admits that God may have superadded thought to matter. I ask if life and thought are not adequate to energise, inform, and move the body? Is not his "distinct entity" superfluous? I do not presume to say what power can or "cannot exist without its appropriate organism." I only affirm that *man* possesses no such independent power.—I am not aware of using any argument which implies "that God cannot exist without an appropriate bodily organization." It is revealed that "God is a spirit." Who can define this? Who can affirm that it excludes every thing from the Almighty, but what is the object of mental contemplation? How then are we to understand the promise to the

"pure in heart" that they "shall *see* God?" Is he not *now* the object of their mental perception?—But this subject "is too high for me."

To bro. H.'s remarks relative to the analogy between the "human soul" and "the brute soul," and "the vital principle in trees and plants," it is sufficient to reply, that as he admits, that "by a general law," the latter "may actually perish with their organisms," so by God's plainly revealed law the former will also perish.

Our friend appears to be approximating to truth. He admits the soul "may be—wholly non-acting in—death." This is poor orthodoxy. It is an imitation of our presumption in differing from "christian communities." *This* certainly is not giving much "advantage to him who argues that the soul is absolutely immortal." An immortal soul "wholly non-acting" for six thousand years, would be an anomaly indeed!

Every christian must of course believe and advocate what appears to be "most consistent with the general tenor of Bible language." I ask bro. H. to inform us how he reconciles his views with the numerous passages I have adduced in opposition. As to "christian communities," he well knows a vast majority of persons embrace the creeds of their fathers and teachers, without following the example of the noble Bereans, who critically searched the scriptures to see whether these things are so.

I agree with Whately, that "no error can be considered as harmless and insignificant which tends to put a stumbling-block in the way of believers in the gospel," &c. The question is, who is teaching "error?" The truth itself, however, may be "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness." To some, it is the power of God. Far be it, however, that we should "needlessly expose our religion to hostility or scorn." If any doctrine is of this character, it appears to me to be the monstrous dogma of immortal souls writhing in ceaseless and ever-increasing torments!

I entreat my friend not to suppose that I consider *the belief* of my "theory of the soul's nature" essential to salvation. I do, however, consider the rejection of the dogma of ceaseless torments as essential to the true knowledge of the revealed character of our Father in Heaven, as "the just God" and as "the Father of mercies."

I have already disclaimed shielding any absurdity by the power of God. The question is, is it absurd to suppose that our "thoughts" and affections which God's word declares "perish" in death, can be restored by a resurrection of the material organism? Is it a mainfest absurdity to suppose that this resurrected organism may have a vivid recollection of its mental activities previous to its dissolution, and a consequent consciousness of its just accountability before the Judge of all the earth? I do not perceive it. The fact of that being "raised" which was "sown"—1 Cor. 15: 44—excludes the idea of "a second origination of ones own proper being." The fact, that in all the numerous passages which relate to the resurrection, there is not a single indication that the reanimation of our body is to be accomplished by a *re-union* with any disembodied spirit, is worthy of the serious and candid consideration of our opponents.

How far my "philosophy differs from that of the materialists of past history," is a question quite unimportant in this discussion. The question is—is it in accordance with divine truth? I will not deny that my blessed Savior is the Son of God, because it is a "point of similarity" with the faith of the Devil. The remarks on "Pantheism of the ancient Stoics and the doctrine of Epicurus," I consider irrelevant. It is no marvel that controversialists should sometimes make unwarrantable inferences from the sentiments of their opponents.

I admit that we are not to reason against the truth of any doctrine from the abuse of it. If, however, we can establish our views of the intermediate state, we certainly demolish the principal basis of purgatorial impositions. Has not this device "exposed religion to hostility and scorn?"

In conclusion, my heart cordially responds to the catholic spirit of our beloved brother. Far be it, that we should cease to love and fellowship any who manifest love to our dear Lord by "the christian life." I reciprocate our brother's courteous remarks, and thank him also for his kind manner in conducting this controversy, and regret if any of his "arguments have been misunderstood." I pray that in his new enterprise, he may be guided by the Spirit of truth, and that, through our Father's grace in His dear Son, we may meet where we shall "know even as (we are) known."

Yours, in love,

HENRY GREW.

From Geo. T. Adams, Boston.

October 20, 1854.

BR. STORRS.—*My dear wife sleeps*—and I remain in sorrow, yet with hope that she will come forth *very soon* to life and immortality, to die no more forever. Amen: praise God. I am indeed lonely; and I can say as the Psalmist—"unless thy law had been my delight, I should then have perished in mine affliction." But yet again, I would respond, "I know, O Lord, that thy judgments are right, and that thou in faithfulness hast afflicted me;" and that it will yield the peaceable fruit of righteousness *unto me* if rightly exercised thereby: which may God grant.

I was with her all night before her death. She said, the Lord is good—he could not be any better, and that she was happy. She was so very weak that she could talk but little; yet I was very happy to be with her, and to see her so strong, and happy in the Lord; and to see her so patient. She fell asleep Thursday morning about 8 o'clock, quietly and peacefully in Jesus.

—

We sympathise with Br. Adams in his loss, and in his hope for the dead. We knew Sister Adams well; and have often experienced her hospitality, with her husband's, at their house. It was *a home.* We trust, and believe, when Jesus shall return "from heaven" she will *awake to Immortality—Eternal Life.*

BR. HENRY JONES—well known to many—fell asleep in this city in October last. He was peaceful in his death, trusting in Jesus, as the "Resur-

rection and the Life," having hope of the future only through him. He was long an advocate of the truth that Immortality, Eternal Life, could be the possession of none except as the gift of God through His Son.

"THE MILLENIAL HARP; *a new collection of Scriptural Hymns*, original and selected, *for Social and Family worship*; adapted to the wants of all Christians. By Joseph Marsh, Rochester N. Y."

We have received a copy of this work, but are not prepared to speak of its merits. It contains 283 Hymns, with a suitable portion of music to accommodate those who wish such help. Price, 12 1-2 cents.

DONATIONS.—James Battersby $8; I. W. Yeates $1; J. W. Young $1; Dr. E. Perkins $1; Wm. Sinclair $1; Saml. Brown $9; B. L. Buckley $4; Wm. Wright $1.

THE EXAMINER for *January* 1st 1855 we intend shall go to press as early as Dec. 26th. On this account we hope that all who intend to sustain the paper in a *semi-monthly* issue will send us their aid without delay. Those who do not commence with the volume may fail to get a perfect one, as we do not mean to publish more copies than are likely to be paid for.

APPOINTMENT.—It is our intention to preach in *Philadelphia*, Sunday the 10th instant. We hope to see all our friends in that city and vicinity at that time.

INDEX FOR 1854.

Æternitas Reviewed—Moncrieff, 156
Appeal to men of Reason, &c.—Dabb, 97
Bible, Defence of—Editor, 4, 99, 121, 139
Bearing the Cross— " 57
Beecher, H. W.,—Grew, 293, 297
Barbarity, Chinese, 228
Catholicism, 12
Clemens, &c., Platonic Philosophers, 38
Children, How to speak to, 231
Church, True position of—Editor, 238
Clarke, Dr. A., Dilemma of, 248, 294
Clarke, Dr. D. W., Review of 216, 232, 248
Cross, Doctrine of—Ham, 17, 53, 85, 116, 133, 148, 177
Cross, A Review—Grew, 84, 132, 164
Conflict, The—Mattison & Editor, 108, 120, 136
Discussion, The, " " 171, 186, 200, 257, 276.
Death of Christ—Editor, 168, 184
" " —White, 252
Death-bed Conversion—Dr. Bond, 302
Death, Going to heaven at—Editor, 216
Dead, State of—Prof. Maurice, 209
Dead, Unconscious—Dr. Fondey, 228
Dragon, The—Editor, 68, 77, 223, 301
Dark Days, 294
Eat her flesh, &c., 42
Exist as long as God—Dr. Harkey, 25
Fire, Delay and Loss by, 96
France, Great projects of, 113
Grew, H., Letter from, 155
" " On Cross, 30, 51
Hudson, C. F., 81
" " Disclaimer from, 117
Hidden Manna—Ham, 241
Hell, Eternal misery of—a tract, 91
Hell, Theological—Editor, 88
Hells, Chinese notion of, 88
Ham, J. Panton, Letter from, 105
Hastings, H. L., to Prof, Mattison, 175
Immortality—Hastings, 65
Immortality, Ancient heathens—Whately, 62
Immortal-soulists in trouble, 36
Immortal-soulism—Saunder's 5th Reader, 72
Irish Evangelist, 86
Imperative nature of Duty—Hudson, 96
Is this Infidelity?—Dabb, 167
Idolatry—Dr. Barlow, 292
Locke, John, Esq., Reasonableness of Ch'ty, 245
Materialism—N. D. George, 40, 104, 248
Modern Divinity—Dr. Foster, 41
Man's Word vs. God's—Dabb, 150
Maurice, Prof., 11, 43, 75
Man's First Sin, 188
More Infidels, 240
More Assumptions, 252
Mattison, Prof., Letter from, 152
Mattison vs. Mattison, 295
Not so short lived—Leviathan, 152
Obedience to God—Editor, 1, 33
Prov. Com., 9, 26, 79, 159
Personal Identity, 27
Personality of Christ, 60
Prayer, Object and efficacy of, 126
Pope, Dr. A. B., Letter from. 143
Philadelphia, Appeal from, and others, 270, 228
Questions, 185
Resurrection and Life—Moncrieff, 94
Ridgeway, C. D., 272
Soul, Theological—Editor, 73
" Is it a distinct entity—Hudson & Grew, 172, 196, 221, 234, 273, 297, 313
" Inquiry about—Moncrieff, 129, 145
" Can it be killed?—Ham, 23
" What is it?—Pinney, 12, 20, 38
Short Dialogue, 237
Spiritual Life—Morris, 102
" " Funeral Sermon, 107
Spirit—Moncrieff's Exp., 125
" Destiny of—Ham, 37
" by Moncrieff, 192, 212, 225, 242, 290, 305
" of Human devotion—Moncrieff, 156
"Storrs' Book"—a Baptist, 189
Still Advancing, N. J. Conf., 208
Test Applied—J. Mayell, 166
Truth Advancing—Ch. Ad., 183
Torments, Eternal—Editor, 56
" Moncrieff's Exp., 206
Why serve the Lord?—Editor, 58
Whole Truth—J. S. White, 78
White, Edw., Letter from 169
World of Woe, 184
With God—Moncrieff, 229
Warning to Ch.—Moncrieff, 142